DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 148 CE 058 130

AUTHOR	Blunt, Adrian, Ed.
TITLE	Commission of Professors of Adult Education. Proceedings of the Annual Conference (Salt Lake City, Utah, October 28-30, 1990).
INSTITUTION	Commission of Professors of Adult Education.
PUB DATE	Oct 90
NOTE	90p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; *Adult Educators; Criticism; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Independent Study; Instructional Improvement; *Land Grant Universities; Mission Statements; Research and Development; Social Change; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Role; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Mock Trials

ABSTRACT

These proceedings are presented in three parts. The first, "The CPAE (Commission of Professors of Adult Education) and Its Mission," contains seven presentations: "Some Observations on the Role of the Commission of Professors" (Collins); "Which Way? This Way and That Way: Recommendations from the Task Forces" (Blunt); "CPAE: Roles and Future Directions" (Karlovic); "On the Nature of Community and the Sound of Voice" (Wilson); "Broken Dialogue: Reflections on the 1990 CPAE Review of Purpose" (Quigley); "When You Find Yourself on the Periphery, Use Your Peripheral Vision" (Norland); and "Observations on the Role and Directions of the Commission of Professors 1990 Conference" (Stubblefield). The second, "The Land Grant University: On Trial," is a mock trial with presentations by the following participants: Sandmann, Rivera, Russell, King, Hildreth, Dawson, Baugher, and Apps. The third part presents the concurrent sessions of five task forces. The first, on university adult education and social change includes the following: "The Adult Education Professor as Intellectual Worker" (Welton); "Strategies for Action within the Academy" (Beder); and "Re-Visioning Our Role in Society" (Horton). The session by the Task Force on Critical Adult Education includes the presentation, "Beyond Postmodernism. Or, Is It Possible that We Need to Return to Where We Started?" (Hanson). From the Task Force on Self-Directed Learning are the following sessions: "Self-Directed Learning: Moving beyond Description" (Caffarella); "Self-Directed Learning Research in the Next Quarter-Century" (Guglielmino); "The Future of Self-Directed Learning Research" (Jarvis); and "Self-Directed Thinking and the Year 2025" (Sisco). The Task Force on Research and Theory-Building includes four presentations: "Research from the Practitioner's Point of View (Anderson); "Two Research Priorities from a Practitioner's Viewpoint" (Zinn); "Issues in Research and Practice" (Hutchinson); and "A Response: The Research to Practice Problem" (Beder). A summary of the session of the Task Force on Instructional Improvement is titled "How Effective Is Your Teaching? Compare Yourself to the Experts" (Nolan, Sisco, Hiemstra, Dean). Two appendices are included: (1) CPAE Fact Sheet; and (2) CPAE Officers and Task Force Chairs, 1989-1990 and 1990-1991. (NLA)

ED333148

COMMISSION OF PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Proceedings of the 1990 Annual Conference

OCTOBER 28 - 30, 1990

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Commission of Professors of Adult Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE058130

COMMISSION OF PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Proceedings of the 1990 Annual Conference

OCTOBER 28 - 30, 1990
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Editor: Adrian Blunt
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan

These Proceedings were edited and prepared for printing at the Desk Top Publishing Unit of the College of Education, University of Saskatchewan.

For additional copies of the 1990 Commission of Professors of Adult Education Annual Conference Proceedings, send $10 (U.S. funds), Canadian requests send $10 (Canadian funds) to:

Adrian Blunt,
College of Education,
University of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon, Sask., Canada
S7N 0W0

Printed on recycled paper
Printing Services, University of Saskatchewan.
Cover layout
Graphics, D.A.V.S. University of Saskatchewan.

Table of Contents

		Page
Editor's Forward		iii
PART I THE CPAE AND ITS MISSION		
Some Observations on the Role of the Commission and Professors	Michael Collins	1
Task Force Reports and Plenary Session Discussion	Adrian Blunt	5
CPAE: Roles and Future Directions	Nancy L. Karlovic	10
On the Nature of Community and the Sound of Voice	Arthur L. Wilson	13
Broken Dialogue: Reflections on the 1990 Commission of Professors of Adult Education Review of Purpose	B. Allan Quigley	16
When You Find Yourself On the Periphery, Use Your Peripheral Vision	Emmalou Van Tilburg Norland	19
Observations on the Role and Directions of the Commission of Professors - 1990 Conference	Harold W. Stubblefield	23
PART II THE LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY: ON TRIAL		
Land Grant University: On Trial	Lorilee R. Sandman	27
Introduction to the Trial	William M. Rivera	29
Testimony for the Plaintiff	Maria Maiorana Russell	32
Testimony for the Plaintiff	Gary King	35
Testimony for the Plaintiff	R.J. Hildreth	37
Testimony for the Plaintiff	James Dawson	40
Statement of the Attorney for the Plaintiff	Shirley C. Baugher	41
Statement by the Attorney for the Defense	Jerold W. Apps	45

PART III CONCURRENT SESSIONS

University Adult Education and Social Change: Re-Visioning Our Roles in Society	Joyce Stalker	50
The Adult Education Professor as Intellectual Worker	Michael Welton	50
Strategies for Action Within the Academy	Hal Beder	52
Re-Visioning our Role in Society	Aimee I. Horton	53
Summary		55
Task Force on Critical Adult Education		55
Adult Education and Post Modern Thought	Phyllis Cunningham,	55
Beyond Postmodernism. Or, Is It Possible That We Need to Return to Where We Started?	Jody Hanson	55
Task Force on Self-Directed Learning		61
Adult Self Directed Learning Research Quo Vadis	Adrianne Bonham	61
Self-Directed Learning: Moving Beyond Description	Rosemary Caffarella	61
Self-Directed Learning Research in the Next Quarter-Century	Lucy M. Guglielmino	62
The Future of Self-Directed Learning Research	Peter Jarvis	63
Self-Directed Thinking and the Year 2025	Burton Sisco	65
Task Force on Research and Theory-Building		66
Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice: Perspectives from Both Sides of the Chasm	Elisabeth Hayes	66
Research from the Practitioner's Point of View	Jean Anderson	66
Two Research Priorities From a Practitioner's Viewpoint	Lorraine Zinn	68
Issues in Research and Practice	Peyton Hutchinson	69
A Response: The Research to Practice Problem	Hal Beder	70
Task Force on Instructional Improvement		73
How Effective is Your Teaching? Compare Yourselves to the Experts	Bob Nolan Burton Sisco Roger Hiemstra Gary Dean	73
APPENDICES		
Commission of Professors of Adult Education - Fact Sheet		77
Commission Officers 1989-1990 and 1990-91		80

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

The compilation of Proceedings of Commission meetings has been a problem for Editors and the Executive for several years. Among the causes of the difficulties experienced are: 1) a lack of foresight on the part of the Commission to appoint an Editor prior to the annual meeting; 2) failure to make explicit the need for presenters to prepare and submit their papers to the Editor in advance of, or shortly after, the annual meeting; 3) insufficient attention to budgetting for the production of the Proceedings; 4) a reluctance to use the most efficient (computer-diskette) means of submitting papers and reports for desk-top publication, and 5) a laissez-faire attitude on the part of some Task Force Chairs who plan their activities without considering the need for Proceedings.

To remedy this situation I would recommend to the membership, based on my experience in producing the 1990 Proceedings, that in the future: 1) the Editor be appointed at the annual meeting to produce the Proceedings of the following year's meeting; 2) the Editor be a member of the CPAE Publications Committee; 3) a budget for Proceedings be submitted by the Editor and included in the CPAE annual budget prepared by the Secretary-Treasurer; 4) all resource persons on the program of the CPAE annual meetings be required to submit a copy of their paper to the Editor prior to the meeting; 5) copies of papers and reports be submitted to the Editor on computer diskettes, and 6) the membership decide at the 1991 annual meeting whether the Proceedings in future should be distributed at the annual meeting.

The 1990 Proceedings were compiled and edited using the following strategy. Each Task Force Chair or Moderator of a session was requested by the Editor during the Annual meeting, to accept responsibility for submitting the papers or reports from their sessions for inclusion in the Proceedings. The advantage for the Editor was that compilation of materials was delegated to the moderators who were the persons most likely to be effective in ensuring submissions were complete and submitted on time. Those moderators or Task Force Chairs who did not submit papers or reports were contacted and requested to co-operate. Several presenters did not submit papers as they had made extemporaneous presentations and were unable to re-construct them.

An important requirement was that the Moderators and Task Force Chairs submit their reports on computer diskettes in addition to providing a print copy. Input of the reports was easily facilitated using the software package, "Apple File Exchange." This process allowed the Editor more time to edit the reports develop a format for the Proceedings, conduct quality checks, and select fonts to achieve a higher quality publication. For the information of future Editors the submission requirements, all of which without exception were fully complied with, were as follows:

Guidelines for CPAE Proceedings Submissions

1. Length: Each report ought not to exceed 8 pages for one person's presentation, double-spaced, 1" margins.
2. Contributors: The names of the person(s) preparing the report(s) ought to be stated exactly as the contributors wish them to appear in the Proceedings.
3. Format: One hard copy AND a copy on a computer diskette.
4. Computer format: The following disk formats are preferred –
   a. Macintosh Microsoft Word 4.0, 3.5" double density

      OR

   Any version of Microsoft Word, Macwrite, WriteNow or Microsoft Works.

      OR

   b. IBM compatible 3.5" or 5.25" in either density using any version of WordPerfect, MS-Word, MS-Works or Wordstar.
5. Label: Please label the diskette with contributor's name and software used.
6. Return: If you wish the diskette to be returned please say so on the hard copy.
7. Deadline: The deadline date for submission is December 15, 1990. If reports are not received a brief notation to that effect will appear in the Proceedings.

Acknowledgements

The following persons submitted reports as requested and made it possible for the 1990 Proceedings to be produced as planned:

Lorilee R. Sandman, Moderator, "Land Grant University: On Trial."

Joyce Stalker, Moderator of the Thematic session, "University Adult Education and Social Change."

Adrianne Bonham, Moderator of the Task Force on Self-Directed Learning concurrent session, "Adult Self-Directed Learning Research: Quo Vadis?"

Elisabeth Hayes, Moderator of the Task Force on Research and Theory Building concurrent session, "Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice: Perspectives from Both Sides of the Chasm."

Bob Nolan, Moderator of the Task Force on Instructional Improvement concurrent session, "How Effective is Your Teaching? Compare Yourselves to the Experts."

In addition the Editor requested five members submit reports on their observations and impressions of the discussions on the future role and directions of the Commission. These reports are presented in Part I of the Proceedings. (See "Which Way? This Way and That Way" for details). The willingness of the following members to share their views through the Proceedings is gratefully acknowledged: Nancy L. Karlovic, Arthur L. Wilson, B. Allan Quigley, Emmalou Van Tilburg Norland and Harold W. Stubblefield.

The Proceedings could not have been produced without the willing assistance of the College of Education staff, Graham Walker (Computer Services) and Diane Favreau, Shannon Cossette and Janet K.Northcott (Word Processing). Thank you one and all.

A final word of thanks to Michael Collins and Hanna Fingeret who gave me the opportunity to work with Commission members with whom I might otherwise not have become so well acquainted.

Should there be errors, or should editorial changes that I made to submissions cause offence, please know that I did my best to avoid errors and that I will not be in a position to repeat my offences as Proceedings Editor.

Adrian Blunt
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
February, 1991

INVITATION

The University of Saskatchewan will host the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE) annual conference May 12-14, 1992 and the Adult Education Research Conference (AERC) annual meeting May 14-17, 1992. All Commission members are cordially invited to attend.

For more information, please contact Adrian Blunt, College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada, S7N 0W0.

PART I

THE CPAE AND ITS MISSION

The Mission of the Commission

(Opening General Session, 7:00 - 9:00 p.m., October 28, 1990)
Hanna Fingeret, Moderator (North Carolina State University)

Some Observations on the Role of the Commission of Professors

Michael Collins
University of Saskatchewan

I have a positive view of the Commission. In my experience it has always been a friendly group, concerned with conviviality in addition to professional pre-occupations. Many of us come here to be with friends and to make new acquaintances who share some of our commitments. (So much the better if our institutions can pay part of the expenses). I had a good sense of this camaraderie when I attended my first meeting as a beginning doctoral student in 1977. Not everyone among us will agree with my cheerful assessment, but I know that in this regard the Commission compares very favorably with other academic associations. I think we ought not to detract from the important convivial aspects of the Commission.

But it is easy to be complacent in our recollections of things past. Have they been that beneficent? Where might we have been remiss? Following last year's meetings Jack Mezirow circulated a slightly provocative statement to some members of the professoriate. It expressed concern about the way adult education is "becoming a market-driven enterprise without social goals". So what's new? The tendency Professor Mezirow highlights might have become more starkly apparent during the recent neo-conservative ascendancy. Yet really there have been no significant changes over the past few decades in the tie between mainstream North American adult education and the market economy. (Although some of us may have become more efficiently entrepreneurial).

There is no consistent critique within the Commission regarding the nature of adult education's involvement in our advanced capitalist society. Contrary to what some of our literature would have us believe, modern adult education practice is far from being a marginalized endeavor. (Though it might be a relatively low-status, low priority occupation). Rather, the modern practice of adult eduction is quite at home within corporately defined projects of America today. In general, it is supportive of the way things are -- the status quo. And there is little in the Commission's agenda over the years that we can draw upon to refute this view. There is no irony for us in the choice of the President's Lady as keynote speaker for this year's national adult education conference of which we are part. We are preparing blithely to act as court jesters in the conference theme, "Adult Education on Trial," while Paulo Freire fails to show for the second keynote speaker role opposite Mrs. Bush.

Mainstream adult education persists with its role, however, in reinforcing prevalent institutional arrangements and non-critical attitudes which sustain class, gender, and racial inequalities. For the conservatives among us, all of this represents a perennial problem that can be sensibly addressed without regard to liberal and socialist projects. (All we need are pedagogical strategies to make the present system work better.

Roll on competency-based education, contract learning, and HRD). Our more liberal academics sit on the fence facilitating adult self-directed learning and critical thinking skills, new designer socialists (critical theorists all) continue to delude themselves, and arriviste post-modern thinkers artfully *joke on* us all. A handful of socialist adult educators still cling to the wreckage, with forlorn hope, wondering whether to raise a cry for some support or strike out for alternative locations.

Surely there are prospects here for rationally worked out adult education strategies in line with genuine democratic development. Admittedly, those of us who also have experience as public school teachers tend to be uneasy about claims for adult education's distinctiveness centered around a North American version of the andragogical theme. But adult education approaches, as opposed to its techniques, can inform the public school system in ways that we have not yet explored.

Can we experiment more boldly with pedagogical approaches that systematically challenge prevailing hegemonic arrangements while avoiding idiosyncratic and poorly conceived confrontations within our institutions? Are we ready to uncouple from our practice the spurious techniques of competency-based education, self-directed learning, learning contracts, and self-paced instruction? Such techniques have proved so readily accommodative to the individualistic neo-conservative vision of a non-society.

I began this presentation by highlighting my experience of the Commission as a good place for friends to meet, but say we wanted to look at the history of the Commission in a more critical light? How did the Commission come to grips with the vital concerns of the 1950's, the 1960's, and the early 70's? In what ways has the Commission subsequently addressed the challenges of t. e neo-conservative era? By and large the record is not worth writing home about.

A few of the professors have played to a different tune, and with great distinction. The names of Jack London and John Ohliger spring to mind. London's concern with adult education in the work-place paid attention to the interests of trade unions. This commitment, if it was ever seriously acknowledged by the Commission, has been largely abandoned. Ohliger paid a price for his stand against mandatory continuing education, an issue around which the Commission could have rallied on moral and practical grounds. Is it now too late for the Commission to drop its pre-occupation with professionalization and take seriously the commitments of Jack London, John Ohliger, and others like them?

I do not want to come across as overly-ingenuous. The Commission has experienced very real pressures to frame its agenda largely within an orientation towards the professionalization of an emerging field. While a few members have consistently questioned this tendency from a moral standpoint, others are impressed by the material benefits that have accrued to other fields of practice through professionalization. Added to the moral arguments, which are persuasive enough in their own right, is the likelihood that the professionalization agenda is simply unattainable for us. A concern for competent performance and the need for m[illegible] secure jobs in adult education (for most of us here that means in academia) are of imm[illegible]diate relevance. But I am convinced that the professionalization focus will not be productive in these regards.

During the past two or three years we have had a little more in the way of critical discourse at the Commission of Professors meetings. We have had critical thinking (as opposed to non-thinking, one supposes), Frankfurt School critical theory (a neo-Marxism invoking, in particular, Habermas, Adorno, Horkheimer, and Marcuse), and post-modernism (drawing largely on the re-deployment of Nietzsche by Foucault, Derrida and other European post-structuralist thinkers). All of this is instructive at an add-on, "implications for adult education", level of analysis. But the academic critical talk within recent proceedings of the Commission has been more than matched by another development. It has been matched by a renewed eagerness to work with business and industry in the kind of ventures that would be carried out just as well without our help.

As part of this academic association, I am uncomfortable about the involvement of our members in business and industry as relatively low level consultants. I am disturbed about our wholesale pre-occupation with the HRD phenomenon. As a professor of adult education with a first degree in business and experience in business systems, I am not at all interested in preparing graduated students for a watered-down MBA. There are more schools of business than there are graduate programs in adult education. Adult education belongs in the work-place but we need to be more critical about the nature of our involvement, and about whose interests we are to serve.

To what extent does our non-reflective collaboration with business and industry contribute to the de-skilling of occupations? Have we considered how the HRD phenomenon can serve to diminish the bargaining power of workers? Can we account for the continuing prevalence of prescriptive curriculum formats, such as CBE, which are antithetical to the principles we tend to espouse? The emerging HRD-CBE coalition might be advanced by enthusiasts for corporate business as an emancipatory force, but it brings a chilling coercive potential for others.

Within the reasonable time limits of this presentation, I am led to raise these critical concerns in a somewhat provocative manner. This is not the place to examine them in depth. But they do need to be addressed. Otherwise, I fear, the modern practice of adult education will define <u>itself</u> as an industry-driven pedagogy.

A number -- perhaps a growing number -- of adult education professors share Jack Mezirow's concern that we may be selling out to the corporate ethos of big business. We hear talk now about the need to return to the commitments of "the founding fathers of the field" who were concerned about adult education for democratic social change. In the United States that tends to mean Edward Lindeman. For the British, it would probably be Richard Tawney. And in Canada, by the same token, it should mean Ned Corbett.

But even the talk about returning to the social democratic values of our "founding fathers" may be a touch complacent. This was brought home to some of us here tonight during a meeting last March at Highlander Folk School. When the values of the founding fathers were invoked yet again, a young black woman professor of adult education asked -- and with only a faint hint of mockery--"Well, what was so wonderful about the founding fathers of adult education?"

Her point, and mine, is that we ought to decide which side of the fence we are on with regard to the critical issues of our time. Clearly, the Commission is not entirely a community of shared interests. So it would have to be a moveable fence, I suppose. The post-modernists will want to de-construct the fence, of course, and play about in the rubble. And the critical theorists a la Habermas will feel compelled to determine *reasonable* limits on how far it should be moved. But, notwithstanding these variations on critical thematics, surely the Commission can begin to take a position on important contemporary issues. Or should we let Mrs. Bush speak for adult education?

Rather than conclude on an irreverent note, I prefer to finish with some bread and butter issues. So what about the current structure of the Commission? I refer mainly to the Task Force set-up. As a way of ensuring that nothing is really changed, it is a very effective arrangement. (And perhaps that is the way it ought to remain). The Task Force Chairs are really pressed to put together an agreed upon program every year. This is understandable. The membership is scattered. Financial resources are woefully inadequate and Task Force Chairs have more urgent priorities. For the most part, Task Force schedules and the proceedings – if and when they get done -- are "done on the side". The prevailing structures and processes are cumbersome. At the same time, your elected executive can have little influence on the content and shape of the program.

If we keep the Task Forces, I suggest we appoint them to prepare reports for public dissemination on issues deemed important by the Commission. In my view the Task Forces as they are currently set up, almost in perpetuity, have become a drag on the Commission's program.

The camaraderie fostered by these annual get-togethers should not be under-valued, but procedures that will bring more relevance to the Commission's activities are needed. Talk about "empowering adult learners" and "putting adult education on trial" is beside the point. Is it feasible now to think in terms of opening a new vision through which we look beyond the sterile concepts of andragogy and self-directed learning? Can we identify concrete pedagogical strategies to meet concrete human needs which are still readily discernible from the prevailing class, gender, and racial inequalities in our communities and our places of work? What are the Commission's positions on the environment, on privatization, on peace and other vital areas of concern where governments prescribe without serious consultation with the people. These should be bread and butter issues for us.

If the Commission is to assume any relevance beyond being just a good place for friends to meet, we have to know on which side of the fence we stand regarding the crucial issues of our times. To the Chair of the Commission, to its executive officers, to my fellow members, and to myself, I pose the question – "where do we go from here?" Quo vadis?

Task Force Reports and Plenary Session Discussion

(General Session, 8:30 - 10:30 a.m., October 30)
Hanna Fingeret, Moderator (North Carolina State University)

Which Way? This Way and That Way: Recommendations from the Task Forces

Adrian Blunt
University of Saskatchewan

The general session of the Commission, held from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 30, was the fourth and final session of the annual meeting that was intended to support a process to explore the purpose of the Commission, its role in meeting the needs of the membership, its internal organization, and how the annual meetings were planned.

At this session each Task Force reported on its discussions about the role of Task Forces and their relation to the purpose and structure of the Commission. The Executive had requested that members examine the history of their particular Task Force and to recommend if, and how, they might wish the Task Force to continue in relationship to the CPAE and future annual meetings. To ensure that there would be an adequate record of the Task Force reports and aspects of the ensuing discussion, to support future planning and discussion I decided to report the main points raised by the Task Forces and to ask five persons to observe and write a personal report on the session for inclusion in the Proceedings.

Each of the five persons was asked to report on any of the following topics: their perceptions of the process and outcomes of the session; the related discussions that had occurred throughout the two days prior to the session; and any views that they might wish to express on the purpose and role of the Commission. My choice of the five persons for this task was made largely on the basis of my interest in their opinions and their willingness to accept the assignment and submit a report before December 1990. The five reports which follow this section of the Proceedings are not presented as a representative sample of members' opinions any more than the contributions of discussants during the session, represented the thinking of members who were present but did not speak. The value of the reports, I hope, rests in their capacity to extend the discussion through the Proceedings and stimulate further consideration of the issues prior to the 1991 annual meeting.

Perhaps some members might wish to write their own statements, or responses to these five, and request that they be distributed through the CAAE Newsletter. Members' views might also be printed and made available to others during registration at the next meeting of CPAE in Montreal, November 1991. Certainly the discussion required for the identification of new directions for the Commission and roles for the Task Forces remains incomplete. While the Executive will need to plan to bring closure to the consultation process and present a new mission statement to the membership, members must accept some responsibility for sustaining discussion and generating alternative futures for consideration.

Task Force Reports

The following 'notes' are based on the reports of the individual Task Forces, which met from 4:30 to 5:30 p.m. on October 29. Each Task Force used flip-charts to record their major points of discussion and recommendations. During the general plenary session on October 30 a reporter made a brief oral presentation for each Task Force and Hanna Fingeret facilitated a discussion and synthesis of the reports.

A. Human Resource Development Task Force

Where shall we go?

Focus on issues. SAppropriate direction to go.

Process for issue identification needed.

Involve expertise within group.

Work toward an agenda which includes Canadian members.
Canadian Concerns
Canadian & U.S. issues

Target materials mail-out prior to meetings to improve effectiveness.

Future issues in HRD:

- Europe 1992
- Immigrants, HRD training
- Work in the future
- Quality of working life (QWL)
  - Tavistock Institute
  - York University
- Share Ontario/Canadian Dept. of Labour efforts in quality of working life
- Minorities in HRD - Implications for training

Involvement of ASTD profession and leadership in HRD Task Force.

Encourage process of small group work sessions.

Encourage development into special interest groups (SIG's)

Schedule SIG meetings with greater freedom of choice.

Hold 3 hour sessions (see 7 above).

Purpose of annual meetings

- safe place

- personal development
- what's happening
- critical issues
- like interest/expertise
- test ideas
- 'sharing'

B. Critical Theory Task Force

- Keep task force for "renewal and networking"
- Give steering committee more authority to devise scheduling etc.
- Next year plan for 3 time slots for the Task Force:
  i. Introductory discussion (Readings first provided in CPAE newsletter)
  ii. Contemporary issues in critical theory reading list.
  iii. Applications of critical theory to practice both our own and other academics.

C. Instructional Improvement Task Force

- Task Forces should be continued because they meet needs of CPAE members old and new.
- Need 2 sessions in '91 - 1 for research (literature) 1 for practice (what works)
- Task force will network over the year to collect cases of exemplary practice and develop a bibliography concerning research on effective teaching.

D. International Task Force

- Task force has been very useful in the past for networking and resources sharing
- Should continue in some form especially now because we need to keep international perspective consciously before us.

Whatever form we take for CPAE conferences we need:
- Sessions of highest quality on topics/areas of interest
- Strategies for integrating and involving new, "young" members

E. Research and Theory Building, and Faculty Development

- Currently Commission lacks of focus.
- Are we meeting needs of all members and participants?
- Lack of communication about meeting schedule and program.
- Don't know why the task forces are not working.
- We want to be 'renewed', we do program planning too much elsewhere.
- We aren't doing leadership development but should be.
- Leadership development could be a focus for CPAE.
- Women and minority issues should be addressed.
- How do we recruit minorities and women into professoriate?

- Important to keep discussion of 8 and 9 in context of CPAE.
- CPAE might move to review awareness about AE as a profession.
- We need more information about status of graduate programs in AE- enrollments, follow-up of grads, EdD vs. Ph.D.
- This (12) would be useful for all members to promote programs.
- Sharing course content important.
- BUT all above has been compiled before
  - where is it shared, how can it be made available?
- How to internationalize our courses?
- Ok so we share a lot of concerns but how do we address them?
- Basic issue - does the annual meeting = CPAE? Or does the TFG, have a life beyond the meeting?
- How do we more effectively involve new members?
- A problem is relying completely on volunteers.
- We'd like to see a lot of what CPAE does in addition tto he annual meeting.

F. Self Directed Learning Task Force

- Regardless of new structure, assure ways for many people to be involved in planning and conducting meeting.

- Have a session for incoming new assistant professors so they can form themselves into an ongoing group (informal not a regular formal meeting).

- Develop within guidelines for whatever structure there is, a clear statement of what each Task Group group and CPAE officer is to do.

- Have CPAE overlap 1 day with AAACE

- Substitute Interest Group (IG) for TFG

- Have a sunset clause - a fixed number of years that an I.G. can continue. Continuing interest must be exhibited to allow continuance beyond 3 years. A case must be made to continue.

- Have/choose/select a group to bring recommendations for us to discuss next year about total structure and process. For next year make no major changes in structure/process.

- Have IG's sponsor research or do other work in addition to sponsoring sessions.

- At registration have members check (X) IG's they wish to be involved in for the next year.

Hannah's Synthesis: Reports of Task Force Group Reports to Plenary Session

a. Critical Theory Report

- Intellectual stimulation by meeting people with similar interests
- Keep TFG's
- Develop general session to model professional associations and their missions and functions.
- Give more authority to Executive to structure the program.

b. Faculty Development and Research and Theory Building

- Keep groups.
- Provide general orientation to CPAE for new members.
- Purpose of Commission: Fac. Development should be integrated into all activities.

Is purpose of TFG's to organize annual meeting or to do other things as well?

c. Human Resource Development

Keep groups - a renewing structure is needed. SIG's? Increase co-ordination with Canadian Association's - develop programming co-operatively with Canadians next year. Use Canadian resources that have been developed.

d. International

Keep focus on international issues. This focus relates to many other groups too. Develop strategies for involving new members.

e. Instructional Improvement

Keep TFG groups - conduct 2 sessions next year. Create ongoing network beyond CPAE meeting and do projects during year.

f. Self Directed Learning

Groups should do some processing during year and bring resources and processes to next year's meeting for overall rethinking of CPAE. Sign up for SIG at registration, maximize involvement of maximum number of persons in planning meeting. Develop written information, about CPAE. SIG's to be of service tontire body. Session for new Professors, Sunset clause for TGF existence. Use newsletter to disseminate information and raise issues.

g. Additional Concerns Raised in Discussion

- New members
- Racial/ethnic composition
- Alternative visions of the organization and other functions.

What kind of organization are we?
- Involvement of additional members.

h. Where do we go from here? Suggestions for 1991

1) Plan for two TFG sessions.
2) Establish a process for further examination of alternative visions of CPAE
3) Hold poster sessions on current research
4) Plan for a new professors session
5) New members orientation session
6) Establish process to increase involvement of members during year
7) Develop more information on the Commission: History, Achievements, M Members interests

CPAE: Roles and Future Directions

Nancy L. Karlovic
Western Washington University

Eloquent and tentative calls for different ways of relating to each other and external stakeholders were formally and informally voiced at the 1990 meeting. The tensions surfacing at the 1990 meeting developed into an impression that the purposes of CPAE according to the 1976 by-laws no longer express the strivings and yearnings of a large number of its members.

Four of the six purposes pose an essential external focus:

1) To broadly disseminate to the field systematic knowledge such as typically included in our programs of graduate study for adult educators;

2) To encourage attention to research topics and methods important for adult education;

3) To help others better understand graduate study for people engaged in adult education work, and;

4) To study and take public positions on issues related to adult education.

Only two purposes promote an internal focus:

1) To facilitate interaction among Commission members so as to strengthen graduate programs for adult educators, and;

2) To facilitate high quality performances by and useful relationships among members.

A larger question could be asked: How well does the use of task forces as the primary mechanism of inclusion and communication promote each of these purposes?

"Well" is a probable response of someone who has just attained the role of task force chair or panelist for next year's meeting if these accomplishments are primarily intended as additional lines on the all-important vita. "Not well" is a probable response if one is interested in forging connections between seemingly disparate areas such as critical theory and HRD. Or, if someone wants to develop a panel on a topic such as the politics of adult education research (what task forces could possibly join together to support this or any other overarching theme?) Or, as in my case, if someone in an interim position needs honest dialogue on useful strategies to protect an adult education graduate program from a political axe in the next academic year.

I am haunted by the implications of a comment made by a long-time adult educator who suggested that a video be made of the new professors in the room so they could remember who they were when they get to retirement age. Frankly, unless questions of identity are internalized and then externalized with power and balance to relevant stakeholders, I doubt very many of those same faces will be seen in a decade, much less by retirement age.

CPAE appears to be entering a phase of intense questioning regarding its appropriate roles relative to its members and to society. Mechanisms such as those suggested below could provide a process by which this questioning process might unfold.

How heretical would it be to try what at least four participants at the 1990 meeting suggested - Change the time spent being "talked at" to "talking with", in other words, to dialogue about mutually felt issues and concerns? This could serve as the preferred format for the opening general session and/or each task force for at least part of the allocated time.

Also, to get at what seems to be deeply felt needs of some members to be heard and responded to, between now and the 1991 meeting, a summary of member responses to a modified Delphi process regarding the stated and desired purposes and accompanying processes of CPAE could be compiled. Part of the 1991 CPAE format could be a "town meeting" monitored so that no one stakeholder or stakeholder group dominates the discussion. Further, those who can not attend but who would like to participate could have their statements read. This meeting could be taped as a basis for further thinking and discussion.

My hope is that we who are CPAE members will choose to develop a safe context for <u>all</u> professors of adult education to share their triumphs and struggles in non-oppressive ways that grow a spirit of community in which even boundary spanners can flourish.

On the Nature of Community and the Sound of Voice

Arthur L. Wilson
University of Georgia

What follows is a fragmentary view from a partial knower. Having been asked to offer comment regarding the recent gathering of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, I do so both willingly and reluctantly. Willingly because, even from a partial viewpoint, I am able to see in the Commission's proceedings ample evidence for substantiating a viewpoint of human interaction which I increasingly recognize as accurate and astute. Reluctantly because my lack of history and engagement with the Commission precludes having the necessary context for substantiating or dismissing the interpretation I bring to the Commission's doings. So I proceed cautiously but with some sense, or at least some hope, that my interpretation has value in its contribution.

What is the essential issue facing the Commission? If we are to take this year's organized activities at face value, it clearly has to do with the nature and purpose of the organization. In the general sessions this was a consistent concern. Recall Apps' nostalgia for a community of like minds, Collins' leftist indictment of the Commission's lack of intent, Colin's personification of a plea for Commission inclusivity, and Snow's valuing of the Commission's role as a professional home. Each brought eloquent, heartfelt yet essentially different statements about the nature and purpose of the Commission. That the current leadership is acutely aware of this is seen both in the selection of particular speakers as well as in the tasks set for the Commission's activities at this meeting. Recall that Task Forces were asked to reflect upon their doings with the intention of considering their functions and accomplishments. Note also the homage of and appeal to the legacy of Myles Horton, as if the organization is seeking to identify its soul. So, in effect, the essential issue goes beyond even intent and purpose to the very identity of the organization.

Reconvening at the last session, the multiplicity of voice again was apparent. Overall, while the Task Force suggestions favored keeping interest group structures, they did so with different tones and intentions. The real issue affronting the Commission became poignant in the round of individual exchanges that concluded this session. One participant was concerned with how the organization could collectively deal with issues beyond the interests of individual groups. Another raised the concern of the Commission's relationship to AAACE while a third noted that two-thirds of the members were not even present. These concerns were followed by a voice echoing Collins' concerns: what was the purpose of the organization, was it not mandated from its history and by-law intent to be socially active in educational causes? This prompted a summary comment regarding whether the Commission was really a goal directed group or a collegial community. In a sense, these comments embody the very issue at hand for the Commission.

What are we to make of this? Can an organization exist with single intent yet equitably celebrate its diversity, such that its voice is a multiplicity of harmony? Further, how is that harmony to be arranged, or better yet, by whom? Or, indeed, is there to be harmony? What I was seeing and hearing from my distance in a back row was a dialogue about values, a sort of rational pleading for particular points of view. Those points of view fundamentally reflected what each proponent believed to be the

most important purpose of the organization; the proposals reflected what each speaker believed was the essentially best position for the organization to take. We need to remember, however, that these viewpoints and values are not solely a product of single and individual experience but are essentially a product of the community to which the proponent binds allegiance. That is, while we hold values singularly, their nature and intent evolve as a product of a particular group of interests. So, while individuals presented views, those views have to be understood as constitutive of particular sets of values of specifiable groups of people. In this respect the existence of the Task Forces themselves within the larger framework of the Commission represents a collection of sets of interests, not simply an organization of single individuals. Since I think this to be an important issue with respect to how the Commission thinks of itself as well as what tasks lie ahead of it, allow me to develop this point a bit.

Richard Bernstein, whose work in the philosophy of science provides an essential guide to the rationality debates of the last thirty years, argues that human action needs to be understood as something more than single agency; it also needs to be understood as reflecting the influences and parameters of the community in which that action occurs. Fundamental to Bernstein's view of rational action is the centrality of human pluralism and conflict: "This vision is a response to the irreducibility of conflict grounded in human plurality....[in which we need to] seek some common ground to reconcile differences through debate, conversation, and dialogue" (Bernstein, 1983, p. 223). But while Bernstein wants us to recognize the conflict of pluralism, he is unwilling to let go of what he considers is a fundamental human quality, the proclivity toward community. Working from Habermas as well as a number of others such as Rorty, Gadamer, and Arendt, Bernstein wants us to recognize and celebrate the human community, what he calls "the shared understandings and experience, intersubjective practices, sense of affinity, solidarity and those tacit affective ties that bind individuals together in a community" (1983, p. 225). It is within these communities of shared understandings that the meaning of human thought and action reside and from which the values for judging their validity emerge. Bernstein wants us to avoid becoming fractured on the relativism of partially but equally sustainable points of view or fixated on the obsession for Archimedean points.

What is apparently central for the Commission at this point in its history is central also for Bernstein. It is essential that we strive to nourish forms of human community: "What we desperately need today is...to seize upon those experiences and struggles in which there are still the glimmerings of solidarity and the promise of dialogical communities in which there can be genuine mutual participation and where reciprocal wooing and persuasion prevail" (Bernstein,1983, p. 228). But if the essence of human community is dialogue, we need to be constantly careful because "there can be no dialogue, no communication unless beliefs, values, commitments, and even emotions and passions are shared in common" (Bernstein, 1986, p. 205). Thus the issue is one of discovering the commonalities which bring people together in communities which, in turn, provides the strength to sustain the pressure of the community's diversity. But Bernstein notes that "too frequently this commonality is not really shared..."(1986, p. 205) but imposed which is an explicit reminder of the hegemonic tendencies of dominant groups.

Bernstein's point of view is relevant because I think the actions of the

Commission exemplify his understanding of human action. It also points to the essential task facing the Commission. How can the Commission sustain its community continuities while allowing for the multiplicity of voice and equal participation in mutual dialogue? Must a single set of interests guide its actions or can it sustain multiple views regarding intent and focus? To consider this question, recall the points of view heard during the Commission's general sessions. I think those speakers and commentators personify the paradox of conflicting pluralism within a community of interests. Bernstein offers no simple solutions to the issue of pluralism within communities. Although his eloquent articulations clearly demarcate the humaness of such products, we are left only with injunctions to find our way to the dialogic communities Bernstein and others wish for.

It may well be true that what actually galvanizes action is a succinct issue. Recent historical events such as the Women's Movement, the Anti-War Movement, or the Civil Rights Movement were essentially eclectic collectivities solidified momentarily by a commonly accepted set of issues. Such events do not well characterize organizations like the Commission or AAACE which are drawn together by less dramatic and more diverse interests. It is in precisely such circumstances that Bernstein's notion of community makes sense, though, especially his plea for nourishing the ties that bind rather than tightening the tensions that dismember: "...no one needs to be reminded of how fragile such communities are....it becomes all the more imperative to try again and again to foster and nurture those forms of communal life in which dialogue, conversation, phronesis, practical discourse, and judgment are concretely embodied in our everyday practice. This is the telos...the practical significance" (1983, p. 229). Is this happening within the Commission? Perhaps. I lack the historical continuity to know. But the actions of this recent meeting suggest that the leadership as well as the members are willing to embark upon such a search.

If the central issue facing the Commission is one of nature and purpose, then its members need to discover those ties that bind even in the face of those interests that divide. The Commission is a living politic of its constitutive interests. Is it not remarkable that 1976 was perhaps the last time it had collectively considered its intent? Perhaps it is that the community that was able to fashion those intentions has now realigned itself so that the tensions of diversity are more obvious than the bindings of continuity.

There are many issues I cannot bring to bear in this space. It is, however, readily evident that I have largely ignored an interpretation of events that would favor similarities over differences. I have done so to show the significance of Bernstein's view for understanding the Commission as a human community that celebrates diversity rather than one which seeks to ameliorate it. The task that lies before the Commission is one of discovering and sustaining its continuities while preserving its diversity. That the Commission disbanded inconclusively, that is, without resolution, is not bad. It did establish precedents for dialogue and continued reflection. The mark will be whether the nature of the Commission ultimately transcends its apparent stasis.

References

Bernstein, R. (1983). Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics,

and praxis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bernstein, R. (1986). The rage against reason. Philosophy and Literature, 10 (2), 186-210.

Broken Dialogue: Reflections on the 1990 Commission of Professors of Adult Education Review of Purpose

B. Allan Quigley
Penn State University

"What the American public always wants is a tragedy with a happy ending." W. Dean Howells to Edith Wharton in conversation, A Backward Glance

Martin Buber, in his writing on effective dialogue, talks about a South American tribe whose word for "far away" translates: "They stare at one another, waiting for the other to volunteer to do what both wish, but are not able to do." In the 1990 trial at the Salt Lake AAACE, where experts in the field were called to testify before a panel of their peers, the discussion centered on the same issues identified by Webster Cotton in 1964 in Adult Education. The same historic issues dominated at the Town Meeting I moderated later at the AAACE conference with some 125 mainly practitioners in attendance. In fact, the Town Meeting, for me, was deja vu all over again, as Yogi Berra said, because just a year earlier at one of the General Sessions of the 1989 Atlantic City CPAE, I chaired a panel with Alan Knox of the University of Wisconsin, Judith Koloski of AAACE, and Phyllis Cunningham of Northern Illinois University entitled, "Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing Education." Following the panel presentations, the option was given of joining one of three discussion groups lead by any one of the three panelists. Interestingly, the audience chose either to join Judy Koloski to talk about profesionalizing the field or Phyllis Cunningham to discuss social change. They did not join Alan Knox's group to discuss ways programs could be more impactful. Thus, for experts at the trial, for practitioners at the town meeting, and among professors at the 1989 Commission meeting, when the larger issues of the field are presented, there were but two central issues with no middle ground. And so it was for Webster Cotton.

In 1964, he stated that we in this field have two "great traditions" (p. 84): The legacy of social change--or "the social reformist tradition" (p. 84)--inherited from Britain with the 1919 Report and the work of Tawney, Mansfield, and Yeaxlee. And, secondly, the development of professionalism--"the professional tradition"--beginning, says Cotton, in the 1930'in the U.S. with the rise of university adult education graduate programs. Whether Cotton was accurate in his identification of dates and persons involved is another discussion but it does seem abundantly clear that we do have two traditions and that they are "far away" from one another. The book I edited in 1989, Fulfilling the promise of adult and continuing education, with twelve authors, sees the writing gravitate to these traditions once again. And, to me, it seems obvious that the issue for the field is how to more clearly recognize, articulate and structure dialogue to mutually enhance these two great traditions--to "do what both wish but are not able to do."

More specifically on the 1990 Commission meeting, I saw it as a microcosm of the

distance between these two traditions--professionalization and social change. Given the opportunity to say what the Commission should be about, the panel of speakers laid the two traditions before the audience. Jerry Apps told about the exclusivity of the first Adult Education professors' annual meetings. In fact, Apps was "suspect"--less than Adult Education Professional--for belonging to Extension Services but was permitted to sit with the professors nevertheless. Professionalism in all its exclusivity reigned at the founding of the Commission. Michael Collins and Scipio Colon articulately reminded the Professors of the social responsibilities of the CPAE and clearly stated that the Commission was not fulfilling these responsibilities. We were gravitating to commercialism and business training; serving the middle class dominant culture and ignoring the needs of marginalized groups in our lust for "professionalism"--reflected in our professoriat, our classrooms, our purpose (expressed or implied), and our course content. Brent Snow gave the point of view of a graduate student which expressed the need for both positions and some frustration as to the express purpose of the Commission beyond a socialization function.

The remaining day and a half was occupied by Task Force meetings and the issue of whether Task Forces were serving the best interests of the Commission. Predicatably, perhaps, each Task Force agreed it was fulfilling a need in the Commission, most asked for more time on the agenda next year, and most agreed that the "Task Force" nomenclature should be changed. The final plenary brought about the denouement of this historical drama. Scipio stated there were two groups of people in the field: "The keepers of the gate and the keepers of the dream." Many of those who might, in this context at least, identify themselves as "gatekeepers" for reasons of upholding what has been a tradition of professionization, left feeling indignant (at least based on the several conversations I had with professors afterwards and the days to follow). Of what value is social responsibility if we are not professionally trained and competent to do the job in the first place, was the question? Many of those who may have identified themselves as keepers of the dream also left feeling indignant because the larger group was evidently recalcitrant at the end of the annual meeting. "Nothing will move this group," was one comment heard. Following historical precedent, the issue was "tabled" for the executive to work on over the coming year.

The classic irony of the 1990 Commission Meeting was that we have great difficulty seeing the degree of ideological difference within the CPAE--if not in the field itself. The professoriat is but a microcosm of the field and, if pushed, we will stare at one another and silently retrench positions. The classic tragedy, however, is, "we are waiting for the other to volunteer to do what both wish, but are not able to do." No one at the conference was <u>opposed</u> to increased social involvement; no one at the meeting was <u>opposed</u> to enhanced professional development or professionalization--as witnessed by the audience response to the opening panel and the outcome of the Task Force discussions. However, unless we find a way to volunteer to do what both wish, it would seem that the common points of agreement which we clearly have will be strained further and further until certain members are indeed opposed to certain positions.

Although as old as the field itself, I think it is critical to note that the debate is not "unhealthy," the issues separating us do not need to be "resolved," not everyone will or logically should subscribe to one ideological position with the same degree of committment. Further, the Commission does not need to be on a values collision

course. We need to build on strength and dialogue. The reflections I would have for future action are three, focused on clarification, background, and future action:

1) No field of study and practice is without ideological difference (e.g. Cervero, 1988). We run the real risk, however, of falling into the trap seen in several more established fields, such as medicine, theology, and social work, of dismissing each other's position as irrelevant. On this issue, there is a need for dialogue on the two specific points: What is a working definition of "professionalism" and how do those in the Commission who are strongly aligned to this value understand the professional development needs and necessary steps to achieve those needs over the long term in this field? Secondly, how would those who hold strongly to social change define the purpose of the field and envision action over the long term? Specifically, what are some of the examples of what the Commission should be doing to fulfill its mission more effectively from both sides of this discussion? We hear and fear the worst, sometimes.

2) A clearer understanding of the history of the field around these two issues would be most helpful. Dialogue, as Buber discusses it, is based not only on trust but respect. The Commission as well as the course content we teach should, and easily could, reflect the two classic ideological streams in the field and respect both. Each has a long and valued story. But, without knowing our past more fully, we enter an ahistorical arena which has dim prospects for a future positive outcome.

3) It is unrealistic if not deleterious to assume everyone will subscribe to a single ideology. As mentioned, the point is to establish a dialogue in the Commission and, perhaps, a dialectic from theoreticians to practitioners throughout the field which will not only permit at least two streams of action and values to co-exist, but to truly inform one another. Does anyone say we should be "unprofessional" or not involved in social issues? The common ground needs to be explored around issues of internal power, issues of creeping institutionalization, issues of ill-trained practitioners, issues of developing effective practitioners with a recognition of the dire issues that face society, and issues of how to develop the competence to constructively assist rather than naively excacerbate society's problems.

When pushed to extremes, we find ourselves **"waiting for the other to volunteer to do what both wish, but are not able to do."** Few would disagree that each commission member subscribes to both ideologies--professional development and social action. And, under usual circumstances, most of us could, indeed have, argued the case for either ideology before a "trial" or a classroom. The "pushing to extremes" can be healthy only if we realize the intentions of each and can periodically cross over the space otherwise created. Through clarification, clarity of purpose, mutual learning, and informed development of joint purpose, we can foster growth in both streams of ideology. Cotton argued for it in 1964, it seems I am arguing for it now.

We have an historically developed set of traditions and, with these, comes the need to volunteer to do what each other wishes the other would do. The coming year will revisit this issue and it will be interesting to see if we will volunteer to change the broken dialogue we are capable of, as witnessed at the 1990 CPAE. Will 1990 be a healthy beginning or will we again bring closure on the discussion--at least until it re-emerges in

the historical cycle?

References

Cervero, R. (1988). Effective continuing education for professionals. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cotton, W. (1964). The challenge confronting American adult education. Adult Education, 14 (2), 80-87.

When You Find Yourself On the Periphery, Use Your Peripheral Vision

Emmalou Van Tilburg Norland
The Ohio State University

> Periphery: the outer part or boundary of something. A surrounding region, area or country. From the Greek, peri (around) and pherein (to carry). Peripheral: Capable of perceiving images laterally that are not directly in one's line of sight. Funk & Wagnall's Standard Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1972, p 488.

Finding myself on the periphery, or outer edge, of the profession of adult education was not all that surprising given that my graduate degrees were not in a "traditional" adult education area nor from a "traditional" adult education program or department. Given my location in the profession (on the fringe), I will try to offer my perceptions of the CPAE annual meeting using my peripheral vision of "the role and future directions of the Commission."

My approach will be to offer comments I heard during the CPAE meeting and at AAACE along with my interpretations of what those comments meant to me. Remember, I am reacting to real data (direct quotes I recorded) as a full-fledged, five-year, albeit fringy, member of the CPAE. The quotes belong to others; the reactions and interpretations belong to me.

Who is or Can Become a Professor of Adult Education? (i.e., What is the Organization's Potential for Growth in Numbers and Diversity?)

During the meeting this year, one colleague described women and people of color as being "on the periphery of adult education". My hypothesis is that probably any "SD" (significantly different) will find him/herself on the edge of a profession as traditional as "professor of adult education".

Professors of adult education form a very distinct subculture; "a group who share a unique life experience or unique qualities within the larger society" (Van Tilburg and Moore, 1989). They have beliefs, values, language, and artifacts which represent their subculture. Someone on the edge of the subculture may share similar beliefs and values, even use the right language, but most likely will be excluded as an important member of the group.

This situation of exclusivity becomes a problem (for the group, that is), when it feels pressure (from within or without) to diversify, expand, or otherwise change. For growth to occur, the boundaries have to move outward, but in the situation described above, those on the fringe move further out while those in the center cluster tighter together. The organization struggles through metamorphosis only to emerge as a different colored caterpillar. I almost believe that I saw the beginnings of this type of metamorphic activity taking place in Salt Lake City.

Let me illustrate. During one conversation with a well-known, respected insider of the CPAE, I mentioned my bewilderment with my five-year struggle at "becoming a real member of the CPAE," not the dues-paying kind but a recognized "member of the academy." The suggestion was made that I seek out others who had similar backgrounds and characteristics to myself (non-traditional degree, non-traditional current job, etc.) and talk with them. Not a bad suggestion, mind you, but I wondered why he hadn't made the suggestion that I sit down with him and talk. My conjecture is that those on the periphery are viewed as valuable only to others on the periphery. Thus, the boundaries can move outward to include others on the periphery (as was recommended to me) but the core of an organization practicing exclusivity generally doesn't expand with its boundaries.

Whether exclusivity is fostered by philosophy, major focus, gender, color, or graduate degree, it still acts to sort and rank. This is a dangerous practice for a profession and organization which rely so heavily on so few for leadership. Exclusivity gives power to a select few and seeks to disempower the rest. I am quite sure that, as individuals, the membership of the CPAE does not support that philosophy and practice; I am disturbed that, as a group, it seems to.

<u>On Reorganizing From Taskforces to Another Alternative</u>

One characteristic of being on the periphery is that most of the time you are invisible. That condition is not all bad. The following comments were made during the taskforce feedback session. I recorded them, while being invisible, during the general discussion which followed the oral reports of the taskforces. Maybe you will recognize your own voice.

"The process we've used has ignored some of the major issues."

"Racial composition of the group...how do we do it? Certainly not through interest groups."

"The Commission should look at alternative visions...other organizational functions; then look at organizational options."

"Pay particular attention to members. We've considered a lot of different options throughout the year; we're now turning inward again."

"Are we a social club? We are foregoing our opportunity to stand for something - take issue with something. We can stand for something; the special interest

groups aren't going to help us do that."

"We need critical reflection and analysis...assess what is there and what is not there."

"The taskforces structure has facilitated the organization moving away from basic issues."

These comments were made by CPAE members, not on the periphery, but seven accepted leaders in the profession. One trend emerges for me in these comments and subsequent discussion: the structure (current or proposed) of CPAE can either facilitate or inhibit growth; growth in diversity, growth in leading the profession, growth in vision. One might play out in his/her mind how the rest of the morning might have progressed: taskforces were suspended for the year so as to be able to assess need, next year's program was planned and will be implemented by a program committee rather than slots assigned to taskforces which will use as desired, a "zero-based budget" approach was adopted for examining the restructuring of the CPAE.

For those of us who were there, we can remember some suggestions similar to the above description, but in the closing moments of the morning session, sure enough, we screeched to a halt, regained our senses and made no real decisions about structure. I got a sense of "closing down the conversation" about structure.

Effects of Exclusivity

During the week in Salt Lake City, I spoke with a variety of individuals who had not participated in the CPAE annual meeting. All were eligible for membership and, in fact, some were members but just didn't care to participate in the annual meeting. The general theme of non-participation for these individuals appeared to me to be that same ugly caterpillar, exclusivity.

"Why bother pretending I'm an accepted member of CPAE - we all know I'm not."

"I stopped going several years ago. I just never felt anyone listened. They were in their own world, really."

"Those guys have their own agendas...mine doesn't fit."

"They don't practice what they preach. That's hard for me to stomach."

"That group is the 'good ole boy system' at its finest."

Being on the periphery is rarely a permanent condition. For some individuals, feelings of being on the periphery led them out of the group, as illustrated by the above comments. For others, the move from the outer edge toward the center is a very slow, sometimes painful, but most always lonely process. Still others are adopted by someone in the family and become a member, not by birth, but by sponsorship. Notice that in these illustrations, it is the individual who is responsible for moving from the

boundary, not the boundary extending to include the individual. This situation suggests that the group, as a whole, doesn't change to fit its potential for growth, but the potential for growth is diminished as individuals change to fit and become the group.

A Stab at the Original Charge

The charge given to me was "to contribute to the Proceedings your thoughts and observations of the discussions held at the annual meeting regarding the role and future directions of the Commission." My perspective has been, at best, as from the periphery if not, at worst, as an outsider. There will, no doubt, be many professors of adult education who will not understand my perspective, having never been on the periphery themselves. My hope is that, at least, they will respect it and consider it valid for me and perhaps others who have experienced being on the periphery of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education.

The future of the commission is either as another color of caterpillar or a mysterious metamorphic creature. Synthesizing what I heard and observed during meetings, in the hall during breaks, in dining rooms filled with professors, and in private conversations with many, I can't predict which it will become. I can only pose the following for consideration:

- The commission must change with the profession of adult education. A culturally diverse profession demands a similar diversity of its body of leaders and teachers.
- There is strength in diversity. Inclusive behavior does not surrender power, it releases and multiplies power.
- Structure should not dictate issues. Issues should guide structure. Issues change; a flexible structure can not only allow for change but facilitate it.
- The responsibility for extending the boundaries to include those on the periphery is the responsibility of those "in charge" of the boundaries. They won't move otherwise. New members and those other individuals on the periphery (because of philosophy, age, gender, culture, race, background or other) can only indicate a willingness to belong.

By losing its original shape and identity, the caterpillar, through metamorphosis, gains a new, more flexible body and lifestyle. Where it once crawled, it now flies. What it once viewed from the ground, it now views from the heavens. How does it know to do this? It is part of the life cycle. The need to change to survive facilitates the action. I'm suggesting that the need is there for the commission to change to survive. This is what I heard, and felt, and observed.

Observations on the Role and Directions of the Commission of Professors 1990 Conference

Harold W. Stubblefield

When I was a doctoral student at Indiana University, I once asked Paul Bergevin why he did not attend the Adult Education Association and Commission of Professors of Adult Education meetings. He replied that he attended regularly at first, but when Commission members began to talk about the same things every year he stopped attending. Bergevin was right about the way conversations seem to recur from year to year. But every professional organization is formed to deal with problems central to that profession, and themes evolve and recur periodically.

At the 1990 Salt Lake City conference the members began to question, with greater intensity than I had seen previously, the purpose and organization of the Commission. I became a member of the Commission in 1973 and have attended almost every annual conference since. My reflections on the 1990 conference discussions about the role and future directions of the Commission begin with an assessment of what the Commission had become before 1990, continues with my observations of what I thought I heard at the 1990 conference, and concludes with my sense of what the future directions of the Commission should be.

The Commission as a Social Institution and Nurturing Association

When I became a member in 1973 the Commission's great achievement as a social institution was the publication of the "Black Book" in 1964, Adult Education: Outlines of an Emerging Field of University Study. Commission sponsored studies of graduate programs in adult education provided an up-to-date account of curriculum and institutional sponsorship.

For me the Commission was a nurturing association that helped to socialize me into my new role as a professor. Like several at the 1990 conference, I found it difficult to get to know many of the professors. They were well-known, published, etc., and I was neither well-known nor published. But I learned a lot from the general session presentations and small group meetings and from informal contact with other professors. In time I moved into leadership roles.

Upon reflection, the Commission did not have a clear understanding of its role as a social institution or believed that function was performed by the AEA/AAACE in which many professors were and are now invaluable leaders. Some time about 1985 and afterwards several members sought to advance the Commission as a social institution and several actions were taken. The UK-US young professor exchange began. Liaisons were established with several national associations. Standards for Graduate Programs were approved and distributed to Deans of Colleges of Education. A proceedings of the annual conference was instituted. Two books were commissioned. The possibility of starting a new professional was explored. In a survey members supported a publication program for the Commission and an expanded Newsletter that would be the forerunner of a professional journal.

Role and Future Directions of the Commission: What I Thought I Heard

Somewhere between the end of the 1989 conference and the beginning of the 1990 conference the momentum toward a social institutional role for the Commission disappeared and was replaced by a concern about the structure of the annual conference.

At the 1990 conference in Salt Lake City, the issue of what the Commission should be and should be about was answered in Task Force reports on the reorganization of the Commission. Other issues surfaced at the Mentoring Breakfast and at General Sessions. These can be grouped into three categories.

Program. There seemed to be general support for continuing the Task Force arrangement in a modified form so that members could work in small interest groups. There seemed to be an consensus that the term Task Force was not appropriate for the purpose of these groups. In a sense, they were not to have any tasks except to be a program format.

Affiliation. More substantive issues emerged, however, around unmet affiliation needs. First, many new members and graduate students had no idea of what the Commission is and its history; they wanted orientation. Second, many members have found it difficult to become involved in the Commission. They reported attending sessions and meeting professors at break time, but they felt that only a few professors knew who they were. They did not feel a part of the Commission. They wanted on-going involvement in some group. Third, several professors who work in a one professor program and teach a wide variety of courses have special needs for materials and teaching strategies and opportunities to discuss their unique situation. Fourth, some members expressed concern about the racial-ethnic composition of the Commission and asked that gender-ethnic issues become the concern of whole Commission and not just that of a special interest group.

Purpose. The question of the larger purpose of the Commission was briefly addressed by several members, but no sustained discussion ensued. As one member expressed it, should the Commission be for collegiality and stimulation or should it be a goal setting and action taking group? Others called for clarification of the purposes or functions of the Commission and for alternative visions of the Commission.
Reflections on Future Directions

Future Directions

In reflecting on the 1990 conference and in projecting the future directions I would like to see the Commision take, I am constrained by what I believe is possible, but I cannot refrain from stating what I believe needs to happen.

The possible. It is clear that the Commission has to become a more effective nurturing association. (a) New members have to be made a part of the Commission earlier. Many come to the Commission without a sponsor, as I did. They do not have a well-known professor from a major program to introduce them to others and help them get places of leadership. We need to be more attentive to the sociological factors. (b) Some better mechanism –an annual survey, perhaps–needs to be put in place to identify

the interests of the members so that members with similar interests can be put in touch with one another, sessions organized to address those interests, and Task Forces (in the real sense of the term) can be organized to adddress these interests. (c) As a nurturing association, the Commission should continually explore the nature of the adult education professorate and graduate education. Whom does the Commission and for what purpose? The issue of the gender-racial-ethnic composition of the adult education professorate is surely one issue that should be addressed.

The needed. Beyond its important function as a nurturing association, the Commission has an obligation to be a social institution. Among its unique responsibilities are (a) the development of practitioners and scholars, (b) the advancement of knowledge about adult education, and (c) the critique of the value systems which guide adult education practice. To achieve this end requires an adequate scholarly and professional apparatus.

As a social institution, the Commission should begin by asking how the well the field of adult education is served by the existing scholarly and professional apparatus. The major agencies of this apparatus were organized in the 1950s, and it is time to critically analysis their continuing value. In 1951 the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. was born in hopes of becoming a unifying and leadership organization for the various fields of practice in adult education. By 1958 it was clear that the hope would not be realized, but the dream persists that the heroic efforts of volunteers and more sophisticated marketing campaigns for new members will revitalize the association. The Adult Education Research Conference as an annual conference and publisher of proceedings is a valuable agency for the diffusion of adult education knowledge, but it provides no leadership role. The Commission of Professors of Adult Education as a collective has no national leadership role nor does it appear to desire one. Beyond the Adult Education Quarterly which publishes research and theory, there is no journal of national stature similar to the Teachers College Record or the Harvard Educational Review to advance scholarship and explore critical issues.

Just as leaders in adult education in the 1950s began to create a scholarly and professional apparatus to serve post-war America, so should leaders begin now to revitalize or create a new scholarly and professional apparatus appropriate for the post-cold war, post-industrial, and post-positivistic social science era. As a nurturing association the Commission will serve some of our affiliation needs well, but if limited to a member nurturing role, it will not serve society well. Perhaps fulfilling that social role will require creating a new organization.

PART II

THE LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY: ON TRIAL

Land Grant University: On Trial

(General Session, 1:30 - 4:30 p.m., October 29)

Lorilee R. Sandmann*
Michigan State University

Is the Land Grant University a historical anachronism? Has, as critics claim, the land grant university lost its way? Are land grant universities producing new knowledge for professional peers or select business interests rather than solving the problems of society? As such universities position themselves as world class research institutions, have they abandoned the land grant mission? What is the Cooperative Extension System role within such a university?

To debate the directions of the land grant university system a mock trial pre-conference program was sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Unit of AAACE in cooperation with the Commission of Professors of Adult Education. The charge: six counts of the land grant university abandoning its mission.

Key "actors" were William Rivera, Maryland, opening statement; Shirley Baugher, Minnesota, attorney for the plaintiff, Jerold Apps, Wisconsin, attorney for the defense; Marie Russell, Connecticut, James Dawson, Alabama, R. J. Hildreth, Farm Foundation, Gary King, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, witnesses for the plaintiff; Paul Larson, Utah, Joan Wright, California, William Griffith, British Columbia and Violet Malone, Illinois, witnesses for the defense. The formal opening and closing statements as well as expert witness testimony follows this overview. Several witnesses had no formal prepared statement, rather their testimony was in spontaneous response to examination by the attorneys. Marilyn Holtham, New York served as bailiff and Judge David Dee of the Salt Lake City Circuit Court presided over the trial. Trial participants were selected for their diverse positions and perspectives regarding the land grant university system.

Charges were drafted by the plaintiff and circulated to all witnesses prior to the trial. Testimony was coordinated by the attorneys and was time limited. The trial drew over 100 spectators, all of whom became members of the jury.

The overall verdict, based on the evidence presented, was <u>not guilty</u>. Specifically, the charges and decisions are:

---

*Director, West Central Regional Exchange, Lifelong Education, Michigan State University and Chair, Cooperative Extension Unit of AAACE.

Charge	Decision
1. The Land Grant University, founded with a tripartite mission, is no longer balanced with regard to its three-prong mission. The Land Grants have worked to become major research and graduate institutions at the sacrifice of undergraduate teaching and the service/outreach function.	Guilty
2. The second Land Grant revolution or adaptation of the mission to the current environment and needs, declared by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in 1985, has not occurred. The historical and primary outreach function of the University, the Cooperative Extension Service, remains with agriculture, 4-H youth development, home economics and community development. There is not a structured outreach function from the total Land Grant University that is based on an analysis of the critical and complex problems of the citizenry or tax payer.	Not guilty
3. The reward structure of merit salary increases, and the criteria for promotion and tenure for faculty within the Land Grant University, does not support the outreach or undergraduate functions of the institution. It is increasingly difficult to convince graduate faculty to teach and advise undergraduate courses/students; and, indeed, faculty outside the Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, or Home Economics often perceive that consulting fees are necessary if they work with a clientele group in the state.	Guilty
4. Land Grants have so abandoned their mission that their competitors and collaborators have assumed the functions of outreach, graduate education and research. The competitors have moved to fill the void left by the Land Grant as it has become a graduate, research institution.	Not Guilty
5. The Land Grant institution has become elite and non-accessible to the greater population...the very premise of the mission on which the institution was established.	Hung Jury

6. Not Guilty

The Land Grant, in accepting dollars for research from partisan and private institutions, has jeopardized its mission and function of objectivity and application of research to the problems of people in society.

The precise outcome of this trial was inconclusive. However, considering the charges raised were by those involved with or genuinely concerned about the land grant university, in essence, benevolent critics, there appears to be a need for serious dialogue about each of the charges and appropriate action to be taken to respond to harsher critics. Discussion needs to continue at a local and institutional level as well as at a national and system level.

Further, an adaptation of the judicial process as a form of program evaluation also deserves expanded use in educational settings. The judicial inquiry process is attractive as a form of evaluation because first it is an effective method of investigating both sides of an issue in an open forum. Second, it can be a unique public relations tools because it permits the active involvement of a diverse audience and a large number of participants. And, third, it affords an interesting--and fun--opportunity for both teaching and learning.

The 1990 CEU Program planning committee which staged the trial included Marilyn Holtham, Cornell University; David Mustian, North Carolina State University; Marilyn Grantham, University of Minnesota; Nancy Cole-Huber, University of Arizona; William Rivera, University of Maryland, Connie McKenna ES/USDA; Lorilee Sandmann, Michigan State University, program chair. Michael Collins, University of Saskatchewan provided special assistance.

An edited videocassette of the trial will be available: for information, contact Lorilee Sandmann, (616) 458-6805.

Introduction to the Trial

William M. Rivera*
University of Maryland

Introduction

Ladies and gentlemen, what you are about to witness is the trial of the Land-Grant System. The Land-Grant System is comprised of three separate but integrated institutions: (1) the agricultural university or college, (2) the agricultural research experiment stations, and (3) the public service extension services. The Land Grant System's mission is therefor threefold; it includes teaching, research and extension.

* Coordinator, Center for International and Extension Development, Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, University of Maryland at College Park.

This is a civil trial--and I sure hope it won't become uncivil--as we proceed to hear the arguments of the plaintiff and the defendant.

The trial is what's called a "product liability" type case--that is, when a person or group complains because a product malfunctions or no longer does what it's supposed to do.

Normally, in such a trial there is an attorney for the plaintiff and an attorney for the defendant. In this case, each side will present expert witnesses only.

On the plaintiff's side, we have those who believe that the Land-Grant System does not meet the needs of contemporary society, that its mission has been usurped by other institutions, that its entire purpose, structure and practice require review, revision, and revitalization if it is to become again what it was intended to be, and became...for a time.

On the defendant's side, we have a contingency that feels just the opposite, that the Land-Grant System is moving with the times, that indeed it involves a responsive set of institutions as witnessed by the recent internal revitalization of the Cooperative Extension System.

Legislative History

When I first considered how I might introduce this trial, the idea was suggested that I might simulate the personalities of the Congressmen who put forward the bills that became enacted into what we now know as (i) the Morrill Act of 1862, (ii) the Hatch Act of 1887, (iii) the Morrill Act of 1890, and (iv) the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.

These names--Morrill, Hatch, Smith and Lever--are the leading names in the escutcheon of the Land-Grant System. The Acts they helped bring into being constitute landmarks in an illustrious and successful series of institutional developments that have marked American higher education history and the advancement of research, extension, and the profession in the agriculture sector.

The Morrill Act of 1862, enacted during the Civil War, at a time of great trauma for the United States, granted land to the States to establish higher education institutions dedicated to agriculture and the trades--so that the sons and daughters of the common people might have access to higher knowledge.

The Hatch Act of 1887 built upon this higher education base. It provided for the establishment of agricultural research experiment stations at the Land-Grant universities and colleges to foster the advancement of knowledge in a field at that time employed over one-third of the population.

The second Morrill Act of 1890 established "separate but equal" higher education institutions in the South, to accommodate those sons and daughters of parents of African origin who were seeking higher education in agriculture and the vocational arts and sciences.

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 further built on the Morrill and Hatch Acts. It recognized that the results of research need to be disseminated to the people. It promoted, in short, "research to practice."

That in a nutshell is the legislative history of the Land-Grant System.

The Need for Change

At this point, you might well ask what all this history has to do with the trial. Well, substantial changes have been occurring in both higher education and in agriculture and agriculturally related industries in the United State.

Since the 1950s, for instance, international shifts in production, transportation system changes, and changes in materials handling and marketing systems have brought about numerous and profound production and processing changes. Those who have not been able to adjust to these changes are no longer in business.

Indeed, current trends suggest that:

1) The number of farms will continue to decline. Youth and adults will leave the farm for employment elsewhere.
2) Demand for land for urban and industrial use will increase.
3) Commercial farms will increase in size. Current farm population is about 2.3% of total U. S. population.
4) Remaining farms will become more specialized. Mixed farming will be limited to the few small farms that continue to exist.
5) Total workers on farms will decline.
6) The number of part-time farms will increase.
7) Food processing and forest product firms will be fewer and larger...while demand will increase for environmentally sustainable production.
8) The number of students enrolling in colleges of agriculture will continue to decline.

On the positive side, "future-shocker" Alvin Toffler -- writing in the November, 1990 issue of The World Monitor, -- predicts that agriculture "with the help of computers, genetics, satellites, and other new technologies, could some day be more advanced, more progressive than all the smokestacks, steel mills, and mines in the world." In his view, knowledge-based agriculture may be the cutting edge of the economic advance tomorrow!

Current analyses of agriculture and higher education, nevertheless, tend to highlight the problems, rather than the potential, facing agriculture and the Land-Grant System. Is it any wonder, then, that the system's higher education, research and extension institutions have come under attack!

But, let me forego any further comment. Let us turn instead to the trial itself, to the plaintiffs and defendants, so that you, the jury--after appropriate instructions from his Honor, Judge David Dee, can make up your own mind about the situation and, if possible, its remediation.

The "Actors"

My final task now is to introduce people. The attorney for the plaintiffs is: Dr. Shirley Baugher, Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota.

The plaintiffs' expert witnesses are: Dr. Jim Hildreth, Managing Director of the Farm Foundation; Dr. Maria Russell, Cooperative Extension, University of Connecticut; Dr. Gary King, Program Director, W. F. Kellogg Foundation; Dr. James Dawson, Administrator, 1890 Programs, Cooperative Extension, Alabama A & M.

The attorneys for the defendants are: Dr. Jerold Apps, Professor of Adult Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Dr. Violet Malone, Cooperative Extension, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign; Dr. Paul Larson, Vice President of Extension and Continuing Education, Utah State University, Logan; Dr. William Griffith, Professor of Adult Education, University of British Columbia at Vancouver; Dr. Joan Wright, Cooperative Extension, University of California-Davis.

Finally a note of thanks to the main organizer and incoming Chair of the Cooperative Extension Unit of the AAACE, Dr. Lorilee Sandmann, who in the midst of changing her job--from the University of Minnesota to Michigan State--managed the organization of this event.

Testimony for the Plaintiff

Maria Maiorana Russell*
University of Connecticut

What Evidence Do We Have in the Land Grant Institutions that Public Service is Treated as a Mission Area?

1) What credence and validity is given the public service mission in institutional statements and documents?

The University of Connecticut mission says that "it is the only educational institution combining both land-grant mandates and university responsibilities in and for the state of Connecticut." Consequently the potential range of university programs and activities is extremely large.
"The university is both the land-grant and the public research university in a state which has one of the highest per capita incomes in the nation. As such it must serve a citizenry which demands and has a right to expect excellence in a state which is highly developed technologically, but which retains the agricultural and intellectual heritage from which it has grown. ....."

"The mission of the university is and must be highly selective. Resources should be directed primarily toward teaching and research; extension and continuing

* Specialist Program Evaluation; Staff and Volunteer Development, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Connecticut

education service are included among such academic programs." (1986) Interpreting the above, no distinction is made for "public service". Our public statements about being in the top 20 research universities has put the focus on research rather than public service --- instead of research and public service. This doesn't serve the public need...it serves the content/discipline paradigm.

In 1976 the 1986 statement above was preceded by: "In addition to degree programs, the University must offer a wide range of learning experiences, as well as mid-career training or retraining for the citizens of Connecticut, through a variety of extension programs. The University should identify itself to the people of the state as the major source of intellectual resources, knowledge, and practical skills to be shared with individuals, the professions, industry, business, labor, citizen groups, and government at all levels."

2) NASULGC has eight councils who make recommendations to the Senate of NASULGC. One is "academic affairs", and each institution no doubt has a vice president or provost for this; another is "research policy and graduate education", and its unlikely that this is ignored in cabinet level officers for this. But how many institutions have cabinet level officers for public service?

   The University of Connecticut added a Vice President for Public Affairs in 1988 (university relations) but it has no high level officer for "extension and continuing education" (A NASULGC Council category) even though it is not clear whether the definition for "public service" includes (non-credit) continuing education courses.

3) Do budget statements as expressions of institutional policy demonstrate a commitment to the public service mission?

   Our budget statement is not described in relation to the mission areas of teaching, research and public service, nor are accountable reports of the University.

   Many department heads are untutored and unsupportive.

   There is no university-wide annual statement of what public service is provided by the University in any systematic way.

4) How does the institutional reward system support public service? What do the reappointment, promotion, and tenure documentation tell us about the value and position of the public service mission area within the institutions?

   UCONN'S PTR form does not mention "public" service leaving faculty to assume that self-governance functions, and professional society contributions are "service".

   Institutional standards and expectations regarding faculty roles and responsibilities related to the public service mission are lacking, except in cases when particular department heads and schools set internal criteria.

5) Does the institution have a clear definition of "public service" as distinguished from -- continuing education for the professions

-- citizenship activities of faculty
-- public work of faculty not related to professional expertise
-- coursework provided in a non-campus location (outreach??)
-- paid consulting
-- institutional contracts

6) How well defined is the relationship between research and its application to the public welfare? Is applied research whose results are applicable to the state's issues of public concern sought by the university for support and sponsorship?

Applied research is accepted at our institution. Whether a criteria for support and sponsorship is its immediate useful application in the state is not known. Probably not.

7) How well committed and how well versed are the gatekeepers at the university about the public service mission?

Seldom is public service the topic of accountable reports within the institution, within the university senate, within the board of trustees, nor with state legislative groups except in occasional budget hearings -- to request, not to account.

8) How would some in the state who wanted to access the expertise of the university for public service purposes, make contact?

I don't know. A public service access 1-800 or 1-900 phone line has been suggested over the past 10 years, but no administrative action has ever resulted.

The agriculture community has the extension service. There is an institute for public service which provides programs for selected local government functions.

References

Maria M. R. (1985), The University of Connecticut Public Service Matrix Storrs: University of Connecticut, Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Institute for Social Inquiry.

University of Connecticut Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Form, revised July 1, 1986.

University of Connecticut Faculty Senate Budget Committee documents.

Marie M. R. (1990), The Truth is...Extension Has Multiple Truths, Journal of Extension, Winter, 1990.

Testimony for the Plaintiff

Gary W. King*
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Thank you for the opportunity to testify for the prosecution, your honor. It is with some sadness and regret that I testify that the land grant has abandoned its mission, as we all understand that mission to be: (1) providing access to higher education for all the people; and (2) helping society solve problems with the application of knowledge, across the range of disciplines and specialties contained in the land grant institution. I still am optimistic that the system can be made to work; the basic structure is in place and can be made to function constructively if the will is present.

Most of us here subscribe to the belief system surrounding the land grant ethic. Our prosecutor could hardly bring herself to articulate the charge. There are people at every land grant institution that have internalized the norms and values of the land grant idea but there are also significant numbers present who don't understand, let alone subscribe. To them, the land grant idea is irrelevant and possibly a little embarrassing since their "significant others" are their disciplinary colleagues at other universities.

My fellow witnesses have articulated very well the dimensions of abandonment--the decline of public service in the face of research and graduate teaching priorities, a faculty reward system skewed toward research activities, a public service organization confined to a small segment of the university, the distorting effects of private research funding, and a less than effective means of applying university knowledge and resources to societal problems.

Therefore, my testimony will be based upon my personal experiences as a program officer at the W. K. Kellogg Foundation in interacting with land grant universities.

President John DiBiaggio of Michigan State University has referred to the Kellogg Foundation as, "the premier land grant foundation." MSU prides itself on being the premier land grant university and President DiBiaggio finds it strategically sound to emphasize this confluence of interest. It is true that the Foundation emphasizes the application of knowledge for bettering the human condition. It also emphasizes education -- W. K. Kellogg said that, "education is the best means of really improving one generation over another." This pragmatism and practicality has led to the Foundation being characterized by Waldemar Nielson in his book, The Big Foundations, as "the shirt-sleeve foundation in the Midwest." We rather enjoy being described in that way.

---

* Program Director, W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Since our organizational philosophies do tend to mesh we have over the years made a substantial number of grants to land grant universities for application of knowledge to improve societal conditions. As you may know, we have supported the establishment of 18 projects for improving rural and agricultural leadership in 23 states. At one institution, the vice president for finance very nearly did not accept our grant in the amount of about half a million dollars because it wasn't accompanied with the usual 45 percent overhead fee. The proposed project was endorsed enthusiastically by the target group, the Cooperative Extension system, the Dean of Agriculture, the Provost of the University, and a number of agricultural and rural organizations who saw the activity to be of great potential benefit to their members and rural society generally. And yet this land grant university, with its mission of public service, very nearly missed the opportunity because of a habitual reliance on overhead charges to which it had become accustomed as a very desirable part of federal research grants.

In another instance, we negotiated to help a land grant institution establish a Center for Public Service and Dissemination. The idea was for the center to serve a liaison function between governmental units and organizations in the society who needed help in addressing problems and the various units of the university that had information and personnel to help address those problems. If the land grant university were organized in an optimal way, such a unit would not be necessary, of course. However, we were supportive of the establishment of such a center hoping that it would lead to an institutionalized system to tap the resources of the total university. The first thing that had to be changed was the name. It was necessary to insert the word "research" someplace so that more faculty members would be interested in participating. It became the Center for Applied Research and Dissemination. Despite this change, in the eight years that the Foundation provided support, the preponderance of faculty participation came from the traditional land grant parts of the university. Despite an original intent to emphasize public service in the faculty reward system, very little changed in the basic patterns of university procedures.

The Foundation also attempted to attract the interest of land-grant university presidents to plan ways to address the pressing problems of youth in our society. A meeting was held of the presidents of about 12 eminent land grant institutions. They all agreed the problems in this area very serious and said they would consider the matter. A second meeting featured the "designated thinkers" at these institutions who were to construct proposals for Foundation consideration. Most of the proposals emphasized research and were very light on innovative ways to address the problems of youth at risk. We finally supported three projects and we hope they'll be good ones. The whole exercise was very disappointing although we hope that the models developed at the three institutions will be attractive to the others.

We also encouraged land grant institutions to enlarge their orientation procedures for new faculty members. A couple of universities have featured trips around the state to help new faculty comprehend what the land grant mission is all about. This constitutes great opportunity for faculty interaction -- to let people from all parts of the institution get better acquainted and acquire a shared understanding of what being at a land grant institution means. Once again the response was very minimal. We have made one grant to support such orientation activities.

It is true that we expect a great deal of our universities in this country. We in this room recognize why they can't be all things to all people. But the land grant idea is as sound now as it was when it was developed. The societal needs are certainly present.

We can all give good reasons why the land grant university has evolved into its present form. But we don't see how there can be a verdict other than guilty in this case. We recommend a sentence that mandates public service -- we feel the accused is amenable to rehabilitation. We are blessed with a uniquely American kind of institution and system of institutions. We need the vision and the resolution to make it work for the people of this country.

Testimony for the Plaintiff

R. J. Hildreth*
Farm Foundation

The basic premise of this testimony is that much of higher education, including the land-grant university, has abandoned its missions of teaching and public service. The major mission as viewed by various publics is that of education, especially undergraduate teaching.

I cite three statements made by Thomas Sowell, a prominent economic scholar, in support of the premise.

1) "The most fundamental misconception of many leading institutions of higher learning is that they are primarily institutions of higher learning" (p. 68).
2) "It would be naive to expect teaching, and especially the teaching of undergraduates, to be the primary concerns of institutions whose money and renown come primarily from research" (p. 68).
3) "Considerable evidence, both impressionistic and statistical, suggests that teaching-education- is one of the lower priorities at many places we continue to call institutions of higher education" (p. 69).

M. Patricia Morris, president of Signa Xi, states in an editorial in American Scientist, that most science faculties are hired and rewarded on the grants they obtain, especially from prestigious agencies and good teaching is taken for granted. She argues that science needs to be placed in a balance with other academic pursuits that will prepare undergraduates to participate in society.

The drive for universities to become known as major research universities has led to incentives for the faculty to decrease their efforts in teaching, especially

---

* Managing Director, Farm Foundation

undergraduate teaching, and public service. Tenure and promotion rules developed by faculty committees and approved by administration put the focus on excellence from the point of view of the discipline rather than the student education or society's problems. Very few of the major questions of science, scholarship or society fit in a single discipline. Society's problems and undergraduate education need research of an applied and adaptive nature as well as basic research.

This state of affairs has led to a decline in legitimacy and support by publics for the major institutions of higher education in my judgment. The legitimacy and support of an organization are interrelated. No amount of wealth or power can keep an organization alive if there is widespread denial of the legitimacy of its role. The reason is that continued performance of any role requires an acceptance of legitimacy by those who are affected. For example, the ability of higher education to receive public support depends upon the willingness of the citizens and legislators to provide funding. As Kenneth Boulding has quipped: "To use a rather crude illustration, a bandit can take your money once, but anyone who wants to take it every week either has to be a landlord or a tax collector."

It is my observation that the legitimacy and support by citizens and legislators is higher for the community colleges than the major institutions of higher learning. But some major institutions are beginning to place emphasis on undergraduate education as a major goal of the university. But, only a few have made progress. As a participant in an advisory committee to the South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station I was impressed with President Max Lennon's statement of the priorities for Clemson University and his emphasis on undergraduate education at a recent meeting. I also found the Agricultural Experiment Station and other research units of the university had a clear understanding of the goal and were making progress in implementing the goal while striving for excellence in research and success in the obtaining of grants.

The comments of Chase Peterson, president of the University of Utah and chairman of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and Robert Clodius, president of NASULGC recognized these problems/opportunities at the November, 1989 meeting of NASULGC. Their comments were published with the title, Three Presidents Speak, by the Association.

President Peterson stated: "If I were to put my thoughts today into one summary sentence it is this: The future greatness of our state universities and our multiple areas of national excellence depend upon our ability to deliver local excellence in areas relevant to our local constituencies" (p.42). He goes on to argue that it may be time for state and land-grant universities to remember their humble origins with the Morrill Act of 1862 and their service in their locality. The maintenance of national and international greatness, and future greatness, will be only from the same local bases that were established by state enabling acts and the Morrill Act. He argues there is a need to return to these local bases and states that universities cannot be greater than they are local. He concludes that it is time for the angel of higher education to look homeward.

President Clodius argues that presidents and chancellors need to reclaim intellectual leadership and vice presidents and deans need to reclaim leadership of the faculty and that department chairs and members of the faculty "need to reassert

professional and moral leadership, to foreswear conflict of interest, greed, outright fraud and to rededicate themselves to search for truth, service to the public, and the cultivation of a turn of mind in their young people that is inquisitive, sensitive, precise, moral, ethical ..." (p. 51-52).

It is my judgment that we are now in the midst of a rapid and fundamental renegotiation of the social contract between society and higher education. The major issue in the renegotiation with society is what higher education will do for whom and how. This is similar to the negotiations that took place in the late 1800s and early 1900s after the passage of the Morrill Act and the subsequent formation of most land-grant universities. Society needs to make clear what is wanted and what they are willing to pay for. The difficulty of obtaining consensus among the various user groups in society should not be minimized. Higher education faculty, administrators and governing boards need to talk with society to find out what is desired and to make clear what is possible with what costs.

I have high hopes for the future ability of higher education to serve society. But a possible outcome of the renegotiation is a decision by society to greatly reduce the funding for higher education. In my judgment, society would lose, but society will also lose if the inward looking, discipline-oriented, research focus of higher education continues.

References

Boulding, K. (1969). The Legitimacy of Central Banks. Paper prepared for the Steering Committee on Fundamental Reappraisal of the Discount Mechanism. Washington D.C. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Morse, M. P. (1990). The Marriage of Research and Teaching. American Scientist Vol. 78, No. 3 May-June.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (1989) Three Presidents Speak. Washington D.C.

Sowell, T. (1990). On Higher learning in America: Some Comments. The Public Interest No. 99. Spring.

Testimony for the Plaintiff

James Dawson*
Alabama A & M University

I think we all will agree that representative Justin Smith Marrill introduced legislation called the 1st Marrill Act of 1862 for the purpose of creating a group of universities to serve various needs of a very broad group of citizens. Also, the 2nd Marrill Act of 1890 was passed to create a group of universities for blacks in the 16 southern states to serve the same purpose. These institutions are commonly known as 1862 and 1890 land grant colleges and universities. We are not concerned in this discussion about the name or the race these institutions were created to serve. Our concern is the purpose for which these colleges and universities were created and how far they deviated from their mission. These institutions have become a servant of large cooperate enterprises, big businesses -- from big farmers to big industrialized businesses. Teaching, research, and extension which are the triparts of the land grant complex are conducted but the benefactors as a whole are those families, farmers, businesses, etc., that have less need for the services.

Our great nation was built mainly from the contributions of small family farms. However, in part, because of action of the land grant complex, small farmers have been pushed aside into a state of isolation, consequently, thousands of small farmers found themselves unable to compete with large farmers and either lost their land or had to give-up farming and look for jobs in nearby cities and towns. Also this tragic situation caused thousands of families to migrate to towns and cities in search for a job which significantly increased unemployment and socioeconomic problems in cities.

Traditionally, land-grant universities have dedicated most of their research, teaching and extension to promoting agricultural technology and providing service to the larger farmers, and big business. The few outreach people-oriented service programs reach a very few.

The Smith Lever Act of 1914 authorized federal appropriations and brought some national coordination to state extension work that had been in operation for several years in some states. The extension movement was to take the teachings of the land grant complex and research of the experiment stations to the people (users) based on their needs and interest. The purpose of making Smith Lever funds available for cooperative extension work was not to use these funds to further enhance big farm operation and neglect providing service to the small farmers as has been done too often in the past.

---

* Administrator 1890 Programs, Alabama A & M University

In 1971 the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress made a small portion of Smith Lever 3-D funds available to do cooperative extension work at the seventeen 1890 land grant institutions and Tuskegee University. The universities pledged as their mission to provide extension service to families with limited resources who were not being served by 1862 service. However, less than two decades have past and some of the officials at these institutions are saying that we will not box ourselves in to only work with small farmers and other families with resources. We have the expertise to work across the spectrum with all people like 1862 institutions.

After being in the extension business for less than two decades, some of these institutions are beginning to move away from addressing some critical problems in rural America encountered by small farmers and other families with limited resources.

Charges Against the Land Grant System: Statement of the Attorney for the Plaintiff

Shirley L. Baugher*
University of Minnesota

Your Honor and members of the jury: the plaintiff charges that the Land Grant University has abandoned its mission. Specifically, the plaintiff registers six charges.

1) The Land Grant University, founded with a tripartite mission, is no longer balanced with regard to its three-prong mission. The Land Grants have worked to become major research and graduate institutions at the sacrifice of undergraduate teaching and the service/outreach function.

2) The second Land Grant revolution or adaptation of the mission to the current environment and needs, declared by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in 1985, has not occurred. The historical and primary outreach function of the University, the Cooperative Extension Service, remains with agriculture, 4-H youth development, home economics and community development. There is not a structured outreach function from the total Land Grant University that is based on an analysis of the critical and complex problems of the citizenry or tax payer.

3) The reward structure of merit salary increases, and the criteria for promotion and tenure for faculty within the Land Grant University, does not support the outreach or undergraduate functions of the institution. It is increasingly difficult to convince graduate faculty to teach and advise undergraduate courses/students; and, indeed, faculty outside the Colleges of Agriculture, Natural Resources, or Home Economics often perceive that consulting fees are necessary if they work with a clientele group in the state.

---

* Associate Dean, College of Human Ecology, And Addistant Dean and Director, Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota

4) Land Grants have so abandoned their mission that their competitors and collaborators have assumed the functions of outreach, graduate education and research. The competitors have moved to fill the void left by the Land Grant as it has become a graduate, research institution.

5) The Land Grant institution has become elite and non-accessible to the greater population . . . . the very premise of the mission on which the institution was established.

6) The Land Grant, in accepting dollars for research from partisan and private institutions, has jeopardized its mission and function of objectivity and application of research to the problems of people in society.

What is the evidence to support these charges?

George Washington and Thomas Jefferson both wrote and spoke about the great need for the "diffusion of knowledge" in society. They spoke from the perspective of the cultural history of the Academy - when the walls of learning were for the elite, the elite of dollars and the elite of class status. Access and diffusion of knowledge was the driving force to establish the Land Grant and State University System. This "naming" (a Land Grant in each state) indicated commitment to a place - which was indeed a revolution in American higher education. Harvard, Yale and Princeton certainly did not feel such commitment to a place and to the people within the boundaries of that place. Daniel Webster, in his defense of Dartmouth College in the famous charter case before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1819, spoke scornfully about the idea that Dartmouth was somehow tied to the state and the people of New Hampshire by the happenstance of location. So, the Land Grant University was founded with clearly defined boundaries in which to practice its mission and purpose. That decision gave a target population and a target state legislature from which to ask for funds.

Some might argue that elitism is good in that it is an indicator of quality . . . . that high expectations create quality. That is true. Elitism that becomes exclusive, however, through stringent graduate education and narrowly focused research at the cost of undergraduate education and service, is the antithesis of the premise for the mission of the Land Grant University. That premise is access to knowledge. The drive for access and diffusion of knowledge created a situation that allowed the interests of the state and university to become intertwined; in some sense, it was intended that the University become the agent of the state with regard to development matters. So, a special linkage of the University and the state evolved as the Land Grant University developed. Some point to the Cooperative Extension field faculty in the counties or areas of the state as the symbol of partnership that insures access. They state that the partnership of federal, state, and county dollars is insurance to the access that addresses critical problems in the community and society. A legal partnership, with a presence of agriculture, 4-H, or home economics extension agents throughout the state does not insure access to the Land Grant University. Tim Size, the Executive Director of the Rural Hospital Cooperative in Wisconsin, speaks with passionate frustration at not being able to access the public health and medical schools at the University of Wisconsin, the home institution of our defense. I interviewed Tim one week ago and asked him about his

relationship with the Land Grant University in Wisconsin. He said, "I believe in what the university is supposed to be about . . . . helping the taxpayers of Wisconsin solve their problems. It is a wealthy resource that is not available to us." Tim, a rural cooperative hospital administrator and a Kellogg Fellow, has a long history of attempting to access the University he knows so well. He worked as an outreach officer of the University for five years. "I quit because there was not a commitment to outreach. The irony is that I am no more successful on the outside working for access than I was on the inside working for access." Tim is not working in agriculture, 4-H, or home economics; he finds access to be difficult.

We listened to a brief history of the establishment of the Land Grant from our esteemed colleague, Dr. Bill Rivera. The real significance of the Hatch Act of 1887 and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 was that they were designed to keep the university at the center of society. It was a distinctly American design for access and diffusion of information. In most other countries, then and now, ministries of government are responsible for access and diffusion of information. Derek Bok, President of Harvard University and author of Universities and the Future of America, stated, "Events since World War II have confirmed the importance of universities to our society. Academic investigators have become the dominant source of new discovery in many fields important to the nation; favored by massive funding from the National Institute of Health, medical school faculties have made striking contributions to the understanding of disease; our national defense has come to depend on science-based inventions, such as the laser, fiber optics and the semiconductor, and many more. Our economy relies increasingly on technological innovations drawn from modern science. Through these developments, we have come to recognize that all advanced nations depend increasingly on three critical elements: new discoveries, highly trained personnel, and expert knowledge, all leading to the declaration that the modern university is the central institution in the post-industrial society."

I ask you, if universities are so important to society, why are two critical measures of well-being, the economy and the human condition, so low in the United States? Our economy has lagged behind almost all other industrial nations in the last 15 years and the social problems are more severe in the United States than elsewhere. A recent United Nations report on the Status of Human Well-Being ranks the United States as number 17 with regard to human development variables. As our economic position in the world has deteriorated, we have climbed to the top, or near the top, of all advanced countries in the percentage of the population who live in poverty, suffer from functional illiteracy, commit violent crimes, become addicted to drugs, and have illegitimate children while in their teens. Are universities contributing as much as they can to help society enjoy efficient corporate management, technological progress, competent government, effective public schools, and the conquest of poverty with its attendant afflictions of crime, drug abuse, and illiteracy? Is higher education today central to society? The plaintiff says no. Serving society is only one of higher education's functions, but it is surely among the most important. At a time when the nation has its full share of difficulties, therefore, the question is not whether the Land Grant University needs to concern itself with society's problems, but whether it is discharging this responsibility as well as it should. The plaintiff charges that it does not.

University/industry, research, and partnerships involving federal and state

agencies have mushroomed. What was long common in agriculture has now spread across virtually the entire University. The anticipated implications of the joint academic/industry/state ventures for internal Land Grant University functioning have been realized. The politics of available dollars from the government and private sector, drives many decisions with regard to research and extension focus. Note two cases in point.

> A researcher at Iowa State University published her research on carcinogenic risk with regard to the preparation of beef over charcoal. The beef industry contacted the state legislative body, who in turn contacted the dean of the college, asking for the researcher's dismissal. A California judge passed a 1987 ruling requiring the University of California to demonstrate how its research was applicable to farming. The ruling was the result of a lawsuit filed against the University by farmers in California.

Two examples of political dollars that drove the response in the University. This alliance with the government and private sector was a focus in the critique of higher education by Page Smith in Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America. He wrote, "The major themes might be characterized as the impoverishment of the spirit by academic fundamentalism, the flight from teaching, the meretriciousness of most academic research; the disintegration of the disciplines, the alliance of the universities with the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and more recently, with biotechnology and communications corporations."

Finally, the plaintiff states that the University no longer has the market niche with regard to the tripartite mission. The Land Grant University is no longer the only institution that assumes a responsibility for being at the core of society and for diffusing knowledge. The Land Grant University has played a critical leadership role in defining the models of teaching, research and service, and others have adopted the model or the intent, to accomplish their goals.

President Nils Hasselmo at the University of Minnesota wrote in September, 1990: "The University is a land-grant institution, with a mission to teach, to conduct research, and to share the fruits of research and service with the state of Minnesota, with the nation, and with the world. Since the founding of the University, a more complex set of institutions for higher education has developed in the state, and the responsibility for public higher education, which was originally ours alone, is now shared among the Technical College System, the Community College System, the State University System, and our university." He further stated, "What makes sense is for each of these systems and institutions, public and private, to contribute to the overall higher education mission in ways that it is best or uniquely qualified to do." The Land Grant University is now challenged to partner with regard to its tri-partite mission because others have adopted the mission of research, teaching and service. The charge today is that the Land Grant University has abandoned its mission. The plaintiff also contends that the mission has abandoned the Land Grant University to seek other institutions willing to accept the challenge . . . to be central to society.

The product, guaranteed at the founding of the Land Grant--practical, applicable research and access to education--does exist, in a limited quantity in some parts (the

traditional departments) of the Land Grant. In other segments of the Land Grant, the product is simply not available. Where it does exist, the quality and the effectiveness of that product is in serious question. Is the Land Grant guilty of abandoning its mission? With deep regret, the plaintiff declares the Land Grant system to be guilty of the charges presented.

For Defense of the Land Grant System: Statement by the Attorney for the Defense

Jerold W. Apps*
University of Wisconsin-Madison

My able colleague has made some rather serious charges against my client, the Land grant institutions of this country. In some ways it is disappointing that the charges were ever drawn. But my client, who is one hundred thirty eight years old this year, has stood up to similar charges over the years. Each time the charges have been made, an examination of the evidence suggests the charges were poorly founded, and often represented some fledgling institution trying to find its place in the sun by pulling down a well established and highly respected land grant system.

What the defense plans to do is examine each of the charges, and show you, the jury, either that the charges were poorly supported, somebody's opinion, or simply wrongheaded thinking.

The overall charge has been made that the Land Grant university has abandoned its mission. The defense will prove to you that the Land Grant university has not abandoned its mission, but is seeking to fine tune its mission to the changing society and the world as no other educational institution.

1) The first charge: The Land Grant university no longer maintains a balance among teaching, research, and outreach--that these institutions have worked to become major research and graduate institutions. Many Land Grant institutions have indeed become major research and graduate training institutions--and of that we all should be thankful. Never in the history of the world has there been such a need for knowledge, and such a need for people trained to discover and create knowledge. If the U.S. is to keep up with the rest of the world, our research base and our cadre of trained scientists and researchers must increase. And Land Grant Universities are helping to do this.

   At the expense of undergraduate and outreach programs? Hardly. Why is that many major Land Grant institutions have had to develop undergraduate enrollment management plans, to control the number of undergraduate students on their campuses? Such clamoring to attend a Land Grant institution surely doesn't sound like lack of attention, or lack of quality in undergraduate education.

---

* Professor of Adult Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison

2) My colleague points out that the primary outreach function of the Land Grant University is a rather traditional Cooperative Extension with agriculture, 4-H, community development and home economics as the main functions. Two points: at some institutions Cooperative Extension has transformed far beyond the traditional four areas she mentions. Examples include small business development, work with youth at risk, and nutrition programs for low income people.

Secondly, most Land Grant universities are emersed in outreach programs that go well beyond those that Cooperative Extension sponsors. Examples include Industry-University groups that work at technology transfer, university centers involved in policy development, business schools that connect directly with firms, the offering of credit and no-credit courses via satellite, cable television and the like. Most Land Grant Universities are doing far more outreach than ever before. Cooperative Extension is by no means the only outreach arm of the Land Grant university--and when Cooperative Extension or the Land Grant university thinks that way they are thinking very traditionally.

3) Reward Structure. I would concede that there are some faculty who would rather teach graduate students than undergraduates. And I would also concede that some faculty choose to remain on campus and prefer not to be involved in outreach activities. Incidentally, there are a fair number of faculty members who should not be encouraged to do outreach, ever, because they simply don't do it well.

Is the compensation different for someone who teaches undergraduates rather than graduates? Is the compensation different for those who do outreach as part of their activities? Perhaps on some campuses, but I can't accept this as a universal occurrence. The key on many campuses is whether the faculty member is able to maintain a respectable research and scholarship program while at same time teaching or doing outreach. Land Grant universities have long prided themselves in employing thoughtful people who are not only teachers in the narrow sense, but they are teacher-scholars. They not only teach, on campus or off campus, but they constantly work at probing their areas of disciplinary interest, searching for new ideas and perspectives, discovering and creating new knowledge.

My colleague mentions that some faculty receive consulting fees for their efforts--what's wrong with consulting fees, particularly for work out-of-state? Sometimes that is the only way to attract and keep top notch faculty members at our institutions.

4) Land Grant universities have abandoned and other institutions and agencies have assumed functions of outreach, teaching and research. It's true that many institutions have taken on these roles. But it is hardly because the Land Grants have failed. There is plenty of work for all, given the many problems our country faces.

The plaintiff makes the point that many other institutions, both private and public, have copied the Land Grant university's extension approach. To be copied is one of he highest forms of praise, I would argue.

5) The Land Grant institution has become elite and non-accessible to the greater population. Elite, yes, non-accessible, no.

We will show why our society needs a unique, elite institution--the Land Grant University. We will show why elite should not be considered an obscene word, but that elitism is required and necessary, is positive and forward looking, and is not exclusionary and high minded. We will argue that elite institutions push the fringes of new knowledge. Elite institutions set the standards for excellence in a society, and thus provide goals toward which all might aspire. We believe that Land Grant Universities can serve as one set of elite institutions that our society so badly needs these days.

Accessible: As I pointed out earlier, except in the area of undergraduate education where budgets often preclude accepting larger and larger numbers of students, there are few limitations on access. Increasingly, Land Grant universities are seeking to make their efforts more accessible to the public. One example is the use of the satellites and other electronic media that carry the Land Grant message far and wide. Off campus courses, interactive computers, new forms of correspondence study, instruction provided in the work place are all examples of making the Land Grant university more accessible.

6) The Land Grant institution accepts dollars from private for-profit firms, which may jeopardize it mission and function. True, the potential is there, but at most major Land Grant institutions, the proportion of money from the private sector is extremely small when the total research and campus budget is considered. On the other hand, Land Grant institutions will need to learn how to work with the private sector, and avoid possible conflicts of interest and other problems associated with such relationships.

7) Social problems. My colleague says "Serving society is only one of higher education's functions, but it is surely among the most important . . . it after all, drove the establishment of the Land Grant movement. At a time when the nation has its full share of difficulties, the question is not whether universities need to concern themselves with society's problems, but whether they are discharging this responsibility as well as they could." I would agree that Land Grant Universities could do more in working on social problems. But my question to the plaintiff, what other educational body exceeds the Land Grant universities in trying to wrestle with social problems?

8) Finally my colleague talks about partnerships and the need for educational institutions such as community colleges, state universities, technical colleges, and the Land Grant institutions to form partnerships with these institutions that are trying to do teaching, research, and outreach.

She wants my client to quit insisting that it has a unique and privileged role in higher education. She wants the Land Grant universities to run around holding hands with every Tom and Jane institution and organization that says, "Hey, let's form a partnership."

In our defense we will point out the many pitfalls related to partnerships. Charles Krauthammer, in a recent Time magazine article wrote, "The great danger with any

collective action is that the more partners you have, the less you can do."

We believe that you, the members of the jury, once you have heard the testimony of our witnesses must find the defendant innocent of each and every charge.

PART III

CONCURRENT SESSSIONS

University Adult Education and Social Change: Re-Visioning Our Roles in Society

(Thematic Session, 11:00 - 12:30 p.m., October 29)

Joyce Stalker, Moderator(University of Calgary)
Michael R. Welton (Dalhousie University)
Hal Beder (Rutgers University)
Amiee Horton (Lindeman Centre, Northern Illinois University)

The topic of democratic social change has been a critical issue at Commission of Professors of Adult Education meetings for at least ten years. Indeed, our absorption with critical theory, postmodernism, feminism, and emancipatory philosophy in general attests to the critical importance of social change to our intellectual pursuits.

The discussion that follows explores the relationship of adult educators located within universities to democratic social change. First, Michael Welton discusses the potential of adult education professors to be intellectual workers and to peak with a distinctive voice. Hal Beder then argues that the university should be the primary target of our collective strategies for social change. Aimee Horton concludes by illustrating the ways in which university and community adult educators can establish mutually beneficial relationships.

The Adult Education Professor as Intellectual Worker

Michael Welton

As adult education professors located within the Academy, we often ask ourselves "What do we profess?" "What is our sense of vocation?" "How do we contribute to progressive social change?" These are complex questions. At the risk of oversimplification, let me suggest that there are two types of intellectual workers: the capitulative and the critical.

In the first case, are the many intellectuals in the Academy who have capitulated to the "logic of the marketplace". We participate in creating the specialized languages which legitimate the status quo. We limit our role to training adult educators to be competent professionals without contesting the very structures that undermine our commitment and values.

In the second case are those critical intellectuals who take as their task to examine the principles underlying the practice of adult education; to provide rational justification of our knowledge and value claims; to challenge the taken-for-granted ideologies masking relations of domination in all of our institutions; to contribute to the development of liberating languages...new meanings, visions, possibilities...by contesting the miserable tendency in our culture to deform educational language into slogans, which are gutted of libratory meaning.

One of the ways we can act as critical intellectuals and serve social change is by contributing to the theoretical clarity which is needed to redesign our institutions. We

enter into such activities and societal dialogue as a distinctive voice in the chorus of voices. Our distinctiveness lies not in how-to-teach-adults. Rather, as critical intellectuals, we ought to invert the usual way "education" responds to pressures from the state, corporate and media curricular structures. We can cease capitulations and contributions to the symbolic legitimation of the technocratic order.

What if we shouted from the andragogical rooftops that our learning perspective on the organization of our common life--work, family, culture, politics, education--provides a specific critical intellectual focus for all of us? We would constantly scrutinize every social structure and movement in terms of whether these structures and movements enable or disable human development, learner-centredness and emancipation. We would break with our professionalised individualism and insist that self-realization requires structures that permit this to occur! We would challenge our society and educationalists to think in new ways. The workplace, for example would be seen as a curricular structure in itself--a cultural environment which has been selected as a set of possibilities for learning transactions. This would give rise to the question "Does the current organization of work enable human development--the unfolding of cognitive, affective, communicative and somatic capacities?"

As intellectuals, we would view the organization of politics in technocratic societies as either permitting dialogue or reinforcing monopoly of dialogue chances in all policy-making transactions. This in turn would generate the question "To what extent does the current organization of decision-making (in organizations and at macro-levels) enable citizens to develop political knowledge, enhance political competence and deepen ability to act prudently?"

Finally, as intellectuals, we would interpret the organization of education as a task of learning how to create the structures that enable people in their everyday lives to learn, to develop and to become autonomous individual and collective actors.

A critical perspective examines all structures from a developmental, learner-centred and emancipatory standpoint. Our task as critical intellectuals committed to progressive social change (the radical democratization of all our institutions) is to articulate several issues. First, we need to develop a philosophically-rich understanding of human capacity to be masters of our lifeworld. Second, we require a socially and historically specific understanding of the competencies needed to redesign and live within learner-centred institutions. Finally, we must undertake a critically attuned examination of the way structured conditions constrain and disable the very possibility of becoming competent, efficacious human actors.

The potential for adult educators within the Academy to be critical intellectuals exists. Indeed, there are those who argue that it is within the academic domain that critical intellectuals should begin their work.

Strategies for Action Within the Academy
Hal Beder

As academics, we have made great progress in thinking about democratic social change. However, we have been much less successful in doing it. Our preoccupation with social change as a theoretical domain has diverted us, perhaps, from addressing the topic with concrete strategic thought. Thus, this paper addresses the question "What should our strategic role be in fostering democratic social change--in contributing to the development of a more just and equal society?"

To answer this question it may be useful to divide our potential sphere of action, our terrain so to speak, into two domains. One domain is defined by our communities of reference outside the university. The south, the inner city, and impoverished rural areas are examples of these domains where some of us have worked. Within this domain I believe that our greatest potential for impact lies not in direct action, but in supporting the actions of others, others who understand the context better than we do, who have direct access to resources, and who are considered to be legitimate in the eyes of their clients. Among other things, support entails providing technical assistance when asked, expressing solidarity, and using the power of our academic freedom to speak out.

If we care about democratic social change, and it seems clear that we do, we obviously need to support the efforts of those who work in disadvantaged milieus. Yet we must also recognize that the very institutions we work for create many of the problems we would seek to redress. Since being within academe strengthens our potential for reforming academe, the university should be the primary target of our collective efforts.

This domain, termed the primary domain, is bounded by the context in which we work, the university. Because we "understand" this domain, have access to its resources, and because we possess a measure of power and legitimacy within it, it is here that our potential for impact is the greatest. For this very pragmatic reason, the university should be our primary target for collective social action.

If we were to target the university for our direct and collective social action what might we do? Several concrete strategies can be undertaken. They address issues of the graduate curriculum, admissions policies, student involvement, involvement within the academe and the academic reward system.

We need to develop curricula and courses that focus on a critical social perspective and see that they are implemented. Although there are some exceptions, the graduate curriculum of adult education is dominated by a psychological orientation in which a social perspective is short changed or completely ignored. Clearly we have the expertise and influence to design and implement a different kind of curricula and course.

We need to attack and change admissions policies which prevent students from oppressed groups from entering our graduate programs. A graduate education is a scarce and valued resource. When universities grant it to the advantaged and ration it to the

disadvantaged, they are perpetuating the inequality of the social order that we seek to change.

We need to involve our students in social action projects through participatory research and other means, for involvement is the best way to facilitate students' understanding of the social context.

We should become more involved in the power structure of the university by serving on key committees and governance structures. This would maximize our influence in the university. We need each others support in this if we are to resist co-optation.

We need to alter the academic reward system that keeps us in the ivory tower. Although direct assaults may prove fruitless and further marginalize us in the process, more indirect strategies designed to circumvent the system may prove useful. For example, we might establish an informal network of those of us who agree to be referees for promotion and who would agree to apply social activist criteria as well as more traditional criteria in their assessments. To the same end, the Commission of Professors of Adult Education might establish a prestigious award for critical theory and/or participatory research.

These then are some of the strategies that can be employed by adult educators within the academic domain to foster democratic social change. The academic domain also provides adult educators with a location within which they can establish meaningful relationships between the university and community. The discussion which follows explores such relationships.

Re-Visioning our Role in Society

Aimee I. Horton

My experience, as co-founder with Tom Heaney, of the Lindeman Center gives me a somewhat different perspective on the role of University adult education in society. The Lindeman Center for Community Empowerment through Education is a small, experimental unit of Northern Illinois University in Chicago. My work there is combined with my experiential "graduate work" as a staff member of the Highlander Center in Tennessee in the 60's. During those years, it was relating its resources to community and student leadership of the Southern Civil Rights Movement. Both Tom and I are guided by our philosophic mentors, Eduard Lindeman and Myles Horton. They believed that adult education could and should contribute to "changing the social order."

Those of us associated with the Lindeman Center are learning that university adult educators can play a role in strengthening and supporting minority and other low income communities and groups in their struggles for a more democratic society at the same time as our programs and research activities within academe benefit from those collaborative efforts.

One such example is in the field of literacy education. In Chicago, as elsewhere,

traditional, school-based "solutions" have had little impact on the widespread problem of illiteracy. Community-oriented literacy programs, in contrast, often demonstrate remarkable success with the poorest and undervalued. Often these programs go unrecognized. In response to this phenomenon, the Lindeman Center sponsored a residential workshop on "Literacy for Empowerment." The workshop focused on the Center's community oriented literacy program. Adult educators from the University and representatives from funding agencies listened to and learned from the community-based teachers about their innovative, grassroots programs and their struggles to survive.

Out of this interactive learning experience, several promising activities are developing which can contribute both to community and University adult education. For example, a strengthened coalition of community-based literacy providers (including Hispanic, African-American, multi-ethnic and local union providers) is forming. It proposes to share program ideas and problems, develop public awareness and plan joint strategies to build increased support.

As well, the Lindeman Center is responding to requests from potential funders for more data on the impact of these community-oriented programs. This information is generally lacking throughout the country. The Center is setting up a steering committee of local community educators to develop a Chicago area participatory research project. The project will provide community researchers with a critical understanding of their own processes, problems and achievements. The Lindeman Center, working with the community researchers, will develop guidelines and resource materials for disseminating more widely what is learned about their community-oriented programs.

The workshop also influenced individuals. One faculty participant left the workshop experience emphasizing the need for writing "the unwritten history of adult education, the community-based movement, gathered from people themselves." She plans to be involved in the participatory research project and to share with her graduate students these non-traditional community approaches to programming and research.

In conclusion, as our current work suggests, the Center is finding that our support of the social change goals and self-help projects of hard-pressed communities contribute to University adult education. New and promising non-traditional models are being identified and "tested" for reaching the so-called "permanent underclass." There are opportunities for research with rather than on community where both faculty and graduate students can learn about research as an empowering kind of adult education. Graduate students are introduced to quite a different perspective on the educational process which begins with community knowledge of its reality, of its problems, and community struggles to change that reality.

Lest we feel that we have "arrived" at some ultimate re-visioning of the role of university adult education in the society, I close with Myles Horton's challenge to educators at all levels:

> If teachers from kindergarten through graduate school spent half their time in their communities, and people from these communities were brought in to do half the teaching, education would become alive and relevant.

Summary

It is clear that adult educators located within the university domain have the potential to effect social change. However, such a capacity can only be realized when clear strategies are created which deal with the constraints and limitations which face us. The challenge for us is to integrate theoretical analyses with the active pursuit of democratic social change. Our response to that challenge may be the ultimate measure of our sincerity and integrity.

Task Force on Critical Adult Education

(Concurrent Session, 9:00 - 10:30 a.m., October 29)

Adult Education and Post Modern Thought

Phyllis Cunningham, Moderator (Northern Illinois University)

Beyond Postmodernism. Or, Is It Possible That We Need to Return to Where We Started?

Jody Hanson

My readings of postmodernism have caused me to wonder in which direction the field of adult education is going. Or, are we, in fact, going in any direction? Perhaps we are on an esoteric treadmill. This paper discusses three of the questions postmodernism raises for me: (1) Postmoderinism's denial of working class collectivity, (2) some of the postmodernist theorists patronizing approaches and (3) postmoderism's lack of concreteness. The paper then goes on to offer what I consider a viable alternative for theorists and practitioners concerned with relevant education for oppressed peoples.

Some postmodernists, starting with the Frankfurt School, are saying that the working class is no longer a potentially revolutionary force. Writers such as Gorz (1980) define environmental groups, women's groups and concerned parents groups as the wave of the future. Possibly interest groups have a role to play in social change, but to relegate the workers-- who are, one notes, also members of the environmental groups, attend women's meetings and are concerned with education for their children-- to a secondary role poses some problems for me. Interest groups are exactly that, interest. And as single issue concerns become central, the larger agenda of class, race and gender is swept aside.

Perhaps the focal point is how one defines the working class. I was lamenting the fact that everyone terms themselves 'middle-class' to my brother who is a bilingual oil rigger-- he speaks English and rig-talk. He gave me one of his scathing 'she has obviously fallen off the academic edge if she is so obtuse that she can't figure this one out' looks and proceeded to explain to me that 'middle' simply means majority. As in most. Therefore, the majority of people, who are neither continually on welfare nor sitting in the board room at McDonald's or GM, are the working middle class. Blue collar, white collar or no collar-- as in sweat shirt-- they (read we) still work for someone or some institution. The standard what we in Canada call T-4, and what I believe you in the United States call the W-4, crowd. Perhaps this relationship to income tax is another

way of looking at the working class of the 1990s.

Is there a major difference between white and blue collar work and responsibilities? My brother, who usually wears a couple of shirts because it is quite cold at the rig this time of year, frequently makes informed, split-second forty to fifty thousand dollar decisions. Perhaps my brother– whose job depends on his ability to make correct assessments-- could advise some school and university administrators as to how to make decisions properly.

The recent wave of young urban professional (yuppie) lay-offs and underemployment may strengthen overal working-class solidarity. After all, shared experience is a wonderful teacher. Just as the depression in the 1930s gave rise to concerned social thinking, so, too, may the economic crisis in the 1990s.

Besides class, another problem I have with postmodernism is the patronizing approach they sometimes take. For example, Henry Giroux (1988) writes, "Some versions of postmodern discourse want to recognize and privilege the marginal without engaging the important issue of what social conditions need to exist before such groups can actually exercise forms of self and social empowerment" (p.19). When I showed Giroux's article to a politically astute Aboriginal colleague who had just returned from Oka, he said that there was no doubt in his mind as to what side of the barricade he wanted that guy to be on. Needless to say, it wasn't with the Warriors. What my colleague objected to was not the paraphrase of Marx, but the tone and condencending nature of the article.

The third problem I have with postmodernism is its lack of concreteness. Just what is it that we are supposed to do to change things? Postmodernists have replaced the working class with interest groups and while the theory appears great, the practice seems to be lacking. The only practice such theorizing appears to support is the practice which leads to tenure.

I feel that criticising the theoretical and practical shortcomings of postmoderinist thought at length is of limited value for adult education. Rather than engaging in ivory tower sniping I prefer to offer an alternative for educators who are concerned with critical practice.

I have chosen the pedagogy of Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919) as exemplary. Luxemburg provides a methodology for combining theory with working-class practice. Establishing democracy in the classroom, combating racism by focusing on internationalism and promoting spontaneous working-class action are also central to Luxemburg's theory and practice. Further, Luxemburg offers her own teaching experience as a model of what, in fact, can be done.

Another reason I have chosen to focus on Luxemburg's work is that I feel her pedagogy offers theoretical and practical considerations for contemporary adult educators. A starting-- or returning to-- point that addresses current educational questions. Like Luxemburg, I am not concerned with the upwardly mobile strivings of those who do not come from standard T-4 (or W-4) backgrounds. The Harvard MBAs will do just fine without me. Instead I want to look at relevant pedagogical practices for

the segment of the working class I live and work with: The Aboriginal people of northern Saskatchewan; women and the marginal-- hookers, boosters and dealers.

While much of the current adult education theory deals with the 'what if', Luxemburg starts from the 'this is what we have to work with and lets get on with it' premise. No beginnings are too small or too insignificant for Luxemburg. This is another consideration which is timely in this era of neo-conservatism. Waiting for the revolution or for university administrators to become more progressive is a process which may take forever, unless we provide a catalyst to speed things up.

Rosa Luxemburg insisted that people had to be educated to socialism. Marx and Engels in The Communist Manifesto (1967) argued that capitalist decision makers have always used education to indoctrinate the people under their control. They wrote, "And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, &c? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education: they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class (p. 100)."

According to Rosa Luxemburg education and politics were inseparable. She used her teaching as a forum to test and clarify her own political position. Luxemburg wrote, "Only by sharpening the subject matter through teaching was I able to develop my ideas" (cited in Nettl, 1966, p. 392). Also consistent with Luxemburg's political philosophy was the fact that she lived her pedagogy. Rather than treating her teaching as a distinct aspect of her life-- something she did from 10 to 3 everyday--, Luxemburg realized that education was interwoven with her politics, her interests and her concerns.

The standard T-4 crowd-- carpenters, union officials, housewives, the occassional intellectual-- were the students in Rosa Luxemburg's classes. She taught at the Social Democratic Party School in Berlin from 1907 until the school closed at the beginning of World War 1. The student makeup of Luxemburg's classes are not unlike the classes found in contemporary trades schools, community colleges and more progressive universities with open admissions policies.

Luxemburg insisted that theory must be combined with working-class practice to be valid. Theory alone amounted to little more than esoteric rantings, while practice not governed by theory was mindless drugery. Combining theory with practice in a real situation was one of Rosa Luxemburg's strongest points, both as an adult educator and as a political theorist.

While Luxemburg's approach to politics, education and, indeed, life, was holistic, her pedagogical work can be subdivided into themes. Among the salient features of Luxemburg's pedagogy was her concern with democracy, internationalism and spontenanity. Democracy-- both as a theory and as a practice-- was central to Luxemburg's philosophy. In keeping with Luxemburg's theory of democracy was her trust in the potential of oppressed peoples to assume control of their own destiny. Socialist democracy is different from the capitalist version. While capitalist democracy recognizes the political sphere, it ignores the social and the economic aspects of the process. Or, casting a ballot for candidates who represent the hues of capitalism once

every four years is hardly true democracy. Capitalist democracy, Luxemburg insisted, "exists only as long as the goals of the society as a whole are identical with those of the capitalists" (Florence, 1975, p. 95). The overthrow of Allende's government in Chile is an example which supports Luxemburg's argument.

Luxemburg constantly reiterated that the process of educating the workers to democracy-- and socialsim-- must be incorporated into their reality. For Luxemburg democracy was an active verb, rather than a passive noun. Democracy, according to Luxemburg, was not an intangible concept that would magically appear after a socialist revolution. Rather, it was an idea that must be worked at daily.

Socialist democracy meant that workers had to be educated to become active participants. Mullaney (1984) wrote, "Social democracy was a mass movement, [Luxemburg] maintained, not a private club that required blind obedience and mechanical subordination" (p. 471). Workers had to be educated to make decisions, and to be responsible for the choices they made.

Luxemburg also insisted that educators had to be educated to become democratic. Basically that meant that teachers had to be prepared to step down from their positions of power, to become involved in their students lives and to be willing to be participants-- not instructors or referees-- in the establishment of democratic decision making. For people interested in this aspect of Luxemburg's work, Elzbieta Ettinger (1986) and Paul Frolich (1972) are worth reading for their accounts of Luxemburg's establishment of democracy, albeit on a small scale, in her classroom.

As well as democracy, internationalism was an issue which Luxemburg insisted was of paramount importance to working-class students. "From Luxemburg's standpoint, socialism will either be international or it will not be at all" (Bronner, 1981, p. 22). Luxemburg's approach to internationalism as a class issue is particularly relevant in contemporary practice for dealing with racism. Prior to capitalism, racism was not a major concern. The Romans, for example, were not concerned with colour, but only with citizenship. Therefore, a black person could be a Roman citizen with full rights and a white person could be a slave without any privileges. It can be argued that racism is a means of dividing the working class. Luxemburg's pedagogy for working class education, supports Szymanski's (1976) argument that "Racial antagonism prevents the interracial unity necessary to successfully demand quality education" (p. 405). But then, divide and conquor is the oldest-- and oftentimes the most effective-- military tactic going.

The concept of democracy also extends into the labour force. One of the many legitimate complaints of the Indian, Metis and Non-Status people of northern Saskatchewan is the fact that they do not have jobs. Often they are marginal workers-- seasonal, temporary. The best jobs in the north go to the members of the dominant hegemony. From the outside, the south.
As jobs in Saskatchewan become increasingly scarce some white workers argue that equal employment rights for minorities is a luxury which the economy cannot afford right now. Luxemburg would argue that full employment for all workers is the issue. Not to fight for minority employment is detrimental to <u>all</u> workers because it weakens class solidarity. Like democracy, racism is not an issue which can wait until after the

revolution to be resolved. It must be confronted on a daily basis. And education has a large part to play in that confrontation.

Luxemburg's theory of spontenanity understood that the Mohawk Warriors are perfectly capable of deterimining their own course of action. And, like my colleague who recently returned from Oka, Luxemburg insisted that oppressed peoples neither particularly need nor want academics to "recognize or privilize" them. Luxemburg's theory of spontaneous action simply means that people will very quickly learn what they need to know when they need to know it. For example, my sister (different mother, different father) at Amachewespimawin reserve once speculated that even a male professor of adult education could likely learn how to set a rabbit snare if he had to. Unlike academics who may take a while to learn to do practical things, Luxemburg argued that the working class was capable of dealing with theory on a daily basis. She wrote, "No coarser insult, no baser aspersion can be thrown against the workers than the remark: 'Theoretical controversies are only for academicians' " (Luxemburg, 1973, p.9). I agree with Luxemburg-- the working class and oppressed peoples will learn very quickly if there is some reason to learn. Another friend, working on a southern reserve, told me about a student in her class who couldn't read very much or remember anything that he had read. Yet the same student passed the written learner's exam for his driver's license on his first attempt. Why? Because he wanted to. Learning how to drive a truck was very important to him.

Nyerere (1968), in talking about relevance in Third World education, wrote, "I want to emphasize that we are not asking you to reduce academic standards in your schools. We are asking you to make the academic subjects relevant (p. 413)." Similarly, the most successful literacy campaignes have been in conjunction with socialist revolutions-- Cuba, Mozambique, Nicaragua.

In summary, Rosa Luxemburg intertwined the themes of democracy, internationalism and spontaneity into her pedagogical practice. Unlike many post-modernist writers, Luxemburg offered both a theory and a practice for liberation. Luxemburg's holistic philosophy offers a theoretically and practically grounded approach to relevant education for oppressed peoples. Contemporary adult educators concerned with critical practice will find Luxemburg's ideas instructive. While Luxemburg realized that educational undertakings were tied into the larger society over which she had no control, she also argued that one had to start where one could. Small beginnings were far better than none at all. Waiting for the revolution to ignite the mass strike was not an option according to Luxemburg.

Given the recent developments in Eastern Europe, Luxemburg's work warrants further study. Whereas Lenin called for centralization, a vanguard party and tight controls, Luxemburg insisted that without massive participation, socialist democracy and education the revolution would fail. Time has proven Luxemburg's prediction correct.

Just as it is time for postmoderinists to re-examine their socialist beginnings, it is time for adult educators to reassess in which direction adult education should proceed. I urge those who are seeking a truly critical pedagogical practice to further examine the work of Rosa Luxemburg -- an examplary adult educator.

References

Bronner, S. (1981). A revolutionary for our times: Rosa Luxemburg. London: Pluto Press.

Ettinger, E. (1986). Rosa Luxemburg: A life. Boston: Beacon Press.

Florence, R. (1975). Marx's daughters. New York: The Dial Press.

Frolich, P. (1972). Rosa Luxemburg: Her life and work (2nd Ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Giroux, H. (1988). Postmodernism and the discourse of the educational criticism. Journal of Education, 170 (3), 5-30.

Gorz, A. (1980). Farewell to the working class: An essay on post-industrical socialism (M. Sonenscher, Trans.). London: Pluto Press.

Luxemburg, R. (1973). Reform or revolution? (2nd Ed.). New York: Pathfinder.

Mullaney, M. (1984). Women and the theory of the 'revolutionary' personality: Comments, criticisms and, suggestions for further study. The Social Science Journal, 21 (2), 49-70.

Nyerere, J. (1968). Freedon and socialism/Uhuru na ujamaa. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Szymanski, A. (1976). Radical discrimination and white gain. American Sociological Review, 41, 403-414.

Task Force on Self-Directed Learning

(Concurrent Session 11:00-12:30 Monday, October 29, 1990)

Adult Self-Directed Learning Research: Quo Vadis?

Adrianne Bonham, Moderator

Content Facilitators:
Rosemary Caffarella (Northern Colorado University)
Lucy Guglielmino (Florida Atlantic University)
Peter Jarvis (University of Surrey)
Burt Sisco (University of Wyoming)

Process Facilitators:
Ralph Brockett (University of Tennessee)
Marci Boucouvalas (Virginia Tech in N. Virginia)
Jean Saul (Texas Women's University)
Lloyd Korhonen (University of Oklahoma)

Adult self-directed learning has been a research focus for a quarter of a century and has changed greatly over that time. What lies ahead in the next quarter-century? Four scenarios were proposed as possible futures. Participants were given time, in small groups, to develop a rationale for deliberately choosing and working toward one or another of these futures. The four original scenarios are presented here.

Self-Directed Learning: Moving Beyond Description*

Rosemary Caffarella

Since Tough's work on self-directed learning projects published in 1971, the area of self-directed learning has captured the imagination of researchers both within and outside of the field of adult education. This research has primarily been descriptive in nature, and grouped in two broad frameworks: self-directed learning as a form of study and self-directed learning as a personal attribute of individual learners. Although there has been a vast array of studies completed in this area, Candy and others have argued that research on self-directed learning has been stalemated in recent years. The most consistent argument, demonstrated in the use of multiple terms for this phenomenon, has been the absence of a consistent theoretical base. Therefore, my first observation is that building a sound theoretical base for self-directed learning is critical to the future of self-directed learning research. Model building is one way to embark on this effort. The journey on this path has already begun in earnest with the work by such writers as Brockett and Hiemstra, Candy, and Grow.

---

*Portions from Merriam, S.B. and Caffarella, R.S. Learning in Adulthood. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1991.

My second observation is that we need to firm up our methodological act in research on self-directed learning. We need to frame our research from a number of different paradigms, depending on the problems being addressed and not the availability of "tried and true" designs and instruments or the latest research "fad". In the same vein, we need to be able to defend to both ourselves as adult educators and to the wider educational community that we have valid and reliable instruments that measure variables important to understanding self-directedness in learning. For example, currently the two most widely used instruments (the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale and the Oddi Continuing Learning Inventory) are both undergoing serious scrutiny, either by the authors of those instruments or other parties.

My last observation is that we should not forget the important why questions--why are we into this line of research anyway? Is this really a critical area for educators to understand more fully, or are we hanging onto it merely because it gives us as adult

educators something "unique" that most other educational researchers have ignored? My own response to these questions is that it is a phenomenon that is essential to gaining a clearer picture of learning in adulthood. This includes both capturing a more focused image of what self-directed learning is all about, as well as a way to assist in rethinking other arenas of research on adult learning such as intelligence, cognition, and cognitive development. In addition, there is a very practical consideration--being self-directed in one's learning is critical to surviving a world of constant personal and societal change.

Self-Directed Learning Research in the Next Quarter-Century

Lucy M. Guglielmino

The request to present "the broadest view possible of self-directed learning in the next quarter-century" presents a plethora of possibilities.

Volume of Research

First and foremost, the volume of research on self-direction in learning will continue to grow. In 1984 Brookfield asserted in the AEQ that research into self-directed adult learning was "the chief growth area in the field of adult education research in the last decade." That trend will continue, fueled by the ever-increasing rate of change in all aspects of adult lives.

Diversity of Research

As highlighted in the 1988 CPAE Self-Directed Learning Task Force session, research in the area of self-direction in learning appears to be following a natural progression; having moved from descriptive studies to instrumentation and validation studies followed by correlational research, greater attention was being given to a wider range of methodologies. This trend will also continue and will become more pronounced. Within the next twenty-five years, significant numbers of longitudinal studies will be able to report preliminary findings, and researchers will no longer be

content to conduct iterations of correlational studies, but will create more complex research designs, many involving a combination of qualitative and quantitative research. Interest will also be focused on those who pursue self-directed study primarily through the use of new technology, such as home-based study accessing on-line data bases through modems. Possible links between learner characteristics and preferred types of resources and methodologies for self-directed learning will also be explored.

Broader Range of Subjects

While research on self-direction in learning has focused primarily on individuals at the middle of the socioeconomic spectrum in the past, future studies will represent a more diverse population of subjects, with representation from both lower and upper socioeconomic groups.

Increased Attention to Efforts to Prepare Learners for Self-Directed Study

Although there have been several efforts to design modules intended to increase individual levels of readiness for self-directed learning, the efforts will intensify. The designs and the means of assessing their impact will become increasingly refined as the demand for self-directed learning as a vital component in combating both individual and institutional obsolescence becomes more apparent.

Multicultural Studies

Individuals in an ever-widening circle of countries are conducting research in self-directed learning. The Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS), has been translated into seven languages and is currently being translated into two more. It has been or is currently being used in research in at least twenty different countries. The results of these studies will make possible a number of interesting multicultural comparisons, leading to hypotheses which will spur new research.

Increased Attention to Self-Directed Learning in Business and Industry

Several trends point to an increasing interest in research in self-directed learning in business and industry: The increasing emphasis on maximal development of human resources, the elimination of levels of management in an effort to streamline organizations, and the increased use of quality circles, which are essentially self-managed teams for problem-solving. These trends, coupled with the massive impact of changing technology, have created a great deal of interest in the relationships between self-directed learning readiness and such variables as performance ratings, level of management, and the ability to deal with change and problem-solve.

The Future of Self-Directed Learning Research

Peter Jarvis

Trying to predict the future is always to tempt providence, yet it is something that we all like to undertake. Social change, or stasis, however, does not have only one cause. There are a number of issues that need to be considered, including the cultural nature of

the phenomenon; the development of assessment of prior learning schemes; the lack of clear theory in adult education (especially that of learning in the social context); the nature of the development of theoretical analysis of adult education; and the relationship between research and scholarship.

The cultural nature of the phenomenon

There is a sense in which most individual learning is self-directed and a function of our humanity; this will remain, whatever the changes in society. Nevertheless, specifically self-directed learning projects might be more prevalent at some times in history than at others. For instance, in the United Kingdom, there was a period in the late 19th century when self-directedness was highly praised. North America has been a continent where individualism and self-directedness have had to flourish, but continued affluence might bring changes; this phenomenon may decline in significance.

Assessment of prior learning

As schemes on the assessment of prior learning become even more acceptable, this might generate more concern to understand the nature of learning from life's experiences. If so, the documentation of self-learning projects in order to allow credit for specific activities might develop, and forms of research into the assessment and standardization of self-directed learning projects might emerge.

Learning theory

Self-directed learning theory has tended to restrict learning to specific forms. If that theory develops sufficiently, self-directed learning might lose prominence and become subsumed within the larger and more significant research into learning per se.

Adult education theory

Adult education theory in America has been based upon pragmatic knowledge; but if greater concern is shown for the foundation disciplines of adult education theory, there will be a greater concern with some issues underlying self-directed learning, such as individualism, freedom and liberty, agency and structure. For instance, if sociological concerns really developed, there might be research into which types of people are more likely to undertake self-directed projects, what social constraints there are upon individuals which inhibit the development of self-directed learning, what the relationships are between self-directed learning and school achievement, etc. The same can be argued for other disciplines.

Research and scholarship

Scholarship and research are both significant, and the issues which underlie the assumptions of self-direction require considerably more academic analysis. This might also happen if more emphasis is given to academic scholarship within adult education.

Self-Directed Thinking and the Year 2025
Burton Sisco

Some years ago, I wrote a piece entitled, "The Road not Taken: From Self-Directed Learning to Self-Directed Thinking." In that piece, I argued that we needed to redirect the research efforts in self-direction from a focus on learning to a focus on thinking since the former was more of a passive activity and the latter, active. I speculated that this area would be a fruitful lacuna for researchers to study since the learning side had been pretty-well documented and the really important stuff needing examination rested in the thinking domain anyway. I'm happy to say that now, in the year 2025, a significant body of research dealing with self-directed thinking has been conducted and more is on the way. To give you a glimpse of some of this work, join me for a brief visit with Dr. Julie Heggie, Director of the Center for Self-Directed Inquiry, as she discusses some of her work.

"For several years now, we at the Center have been involved in exciting research dealing with how the mind works in relation to individual thinking and learning. The concept that we have been exploring is something called 'self-regulation' where the individual is aware of how he or she processes information, controls stressful situations, maintains optimum motivation, effectively and efficiently manages time, successfully copes with ambiguity, and generally knows how to think and learn."

"Years ago, this was called metacognition, but that was too limiting a term since it referred only to the cognitive aspects associated with the thinking and learning process. We now believe that the thinking process has a number of components including cognitive, conative, biological, and physiological attributes. Each of these play a kind of synergy where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts and helps explain individual differences."

"The really intriguing part is that the one factor that consistently distinguishes an individual who exhibits what might be called 'successful thinking behaviors' from a person who does not, is a greater degree of self-regulating knowledge and skill. For example, our studies with twins separated at birth and growing up in entirely different environments have revealed significant differences in terms of academic and work-related performance. Yes, there are similar personality characteristics and certain habits that seem to be evident in the behaviors of our twin subjects, but how each twin has performed in school and on the job is decidedly different."

"According to our research the main reason for such differences is related to how the person has learned to think in a variety of settings. In school, the differences began to appear by the fourth grade and generally continued unless some corrective intervention took place. In the work setting, the measures were more difficult to articulate and compare, but based on such measures as types of occupations, promotions or employee progress, peer assessments, and supervisor evaluations, we have been able to see significant differences. We have even extended our work to looking at the types of individually guided learning activities (referred to as learning projects years ago) and noted major differences in the kinds of activities undertaken, the skill level employed, and the resulting outcomes. What this line of inquiry suggests to us is the importance of learning to think and thinking to learn. There is clearly a relationship here and the

notion of self-regulation that I mentioned earlier seems to be the key ingredient in this enterprise."

"More recently, we have begun to look into how self-regulating behaviors are acquired and whether they can be taught. Prior work conducted in the 1990s suggested they could be, but unfortunately, much of this work has been either forgotten or overlooked. We are now in the process of looking at this important arena and with the help of adult education researchers at the annual CPAE meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, we hope to generate a list of questions and projects to explore. As a means of helping us direct our research efforts appropriately, I am asking interested persons such as yourself to discuss this important area and offer suggestion for us to pursue. Can I count on your assistance?"

Task Force on Research and Theory-Building

(Concurrent Session, 9:00 - 10:30 a.m., October 29)

Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice: Perspectives from Both Sides of the Chasm

Elisabeth Hayes, Moderator (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Jean Anderson (Denver Community Technical Skills Center)
Hal Beder (Rutgers University)
Ron Cervero (University of Georgia)
Peyton Hutchinson (Richard J. Daley College)
Victoria Marsick (Columbia University)
Lorraine Zinn (Boulder School of Massage Therapy)

An ongoing concern in adult education is the relationship (or lack of one) between research and practice. The purpose of this session was to continue a dialogue between researchers and practitioners in adult education, in the hopes of promoting greater collaboration in our efforts to improve the field. To provide a starting point for discussion, a panel of researchers
and practitioners were invited to describe their perspectives on current as well as potential relationships. The audience then had the opportunity to join the panel in a discussion of implications for further integration of research and practice.

Research from the Practitioner's Point of View

Jean Anderson

I would like to offer a personal perspective on a number of points that are central to this discussion:

<u>How I become aware of current research and theory</u>

Extremely difficult due to a very real lack of time and possible lack of belief of relevance. I haven't read an original piece of research since I was in school! I do believe

it is my professional responsibility to remain as current as possible, and the most accessible sources for current thought remain workshops and texts from conferences (local, state, regional, international), magazines, newsletters, and journals from professional associations, and whatever is passed on to me through an informal network of peers. As with any adult, my focus is always on what I need immediately to improve my work and to improve the work of my staff. I have found very little to match my needs for administration of an adult education organization, especially anything that seeks to interrelate theories of management and theories of adult learning and teaching. (Potential research topic for me to explore during my doctoral studies!)

How I use research and theory as a practitioner

Because of my orientation as an adult educator, I believe I have a responsibility to develop my staff. So, I serve as the link between the professional resources noted above and the staff. This is done very informally by passing on copies of articles of immediate relevance and by several workshops during the year. The most important influence is assisting them in developing a self-image as adult educators, often accomplished during individual conversations as the connections are made between principles of adult learning and teaching and their current practice. I have also enabled our Center to be a Beta site for at least one, possibly two, projects which heightens staff's awareness of research.

Should I/we bother to provide that link?

In that it adds to the "pool" of people who consider themselves to be adult educators, yes. In that it improves their ability to perform their jobs, yes. Yes, I believe we should "bother" with trying to access and translate research and theory into practice. But it's not a pretty picture. The need to "fight" for accessible and relevant material and, if it's in original form and often even when it's not, the need to translate it into English, makes one weary at times!

Besides, do "they" listen to us?

It would seem that both the "world of the ivy-covered walls" and the world of the "cold, hard pavement" would need each other and should learn from each other. But the stigma of "but you don't understand me" is alive and well and without the development and support of people to serve as links between the two worlds, they will remain isolated from each other. There needs to be people who are able and willing to bridge this gap - yes, there needs to be a gap to ensure clarity of divergent perspectives. How and where does this happen? Do we teach practitioners to do research? Do we "force" researchers to apply their theories themselves?

Should researchers listen to us?

Yes, of course. We are vital in that we know the immediate needs for research and, if research is to be truly valuable it needs to address these issues - and not the possibly self-centered interests of the individual researcher. Harsh, perhaps, but it communicates the point. Practitioners would love to be able to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently and theory and research would help. Perhaps it's just my

ignorance that I don't know what's been done and my lack of time and ability to access it and pass it on. Which is why I need to listen to the researchers today.... Lack of time seems so cheap an excuse, somehow. But there is truth in it.

And actually, I do believe that we in the field value what we do - that our work is as valid as research if not more so. (It's that old bias, again. Sorry!) We each just need to learn how to translate into the other's world, so that teachers hear principles of adult learning in terms of "what do I do next in my classroom" and researchers hear "what do I need to pursue to help my chose profession function professionally with a sound framework?" Both perspectives contribute to the body of knowledge from which we grow and develop in our profession.

Two Research Priorities From a Practitioner's Viewpoint
Lorraine Zinn

My perspective is also essentially that of a practitioner. As Education Director of a private, vocational school. I act as Academic Dean, Dean of Faculty, and Dean of Students (small school; multiple roles!). This is an accredited school, offering a certification program as well as continuing professional education and community education. The average age of our students is 31+.

In this role, as in other roles previously, a major part of my work is to hire, supervise, and provide orientation/in-service training for faculty. I also provide extensive assistance in course planning and curriculum development/revision.

Instructors hired by this school are not required to have any formal teaching background (as is generally true at all post-secondary institutions). They are usually quite knowledgeable and experience in at least one area of our curriculum, which ranges from massage technique to psychology to anatomy and physiology. Although they have generally taught in some setting prior to being hired by the School, they may never have had to deal with grading students' work. They also are not usually familiar with the term "adult education," and are unaware that they are considered "practitioners."

This situation is typical of other postsecondary institutions where I have worked, functioning in similar roles (e.g., as Director of Faculty and Curriculum for the Career Services Division of a much larger 4-year college). Thus, the research-related issues I mention have arisen from a much broader perspective than my present employment.

I believe that a reality for today and the future is that the great majority of "adult education" will be offered by individuals who do not necessarily identify themselves as "adult educators," and probably have no formal teaching preparation--at least in adult education. Their teaching abilities may range widely; but with inservice training and appropriate guidance, some of them become very good educators of adults.

So much for context; here are areas that continue to be of great interest to me:

Comparative Research on the Abilities and Performance of Adults Studying at the Postsecondary Level

There is a pervasive belief that adult students who get higher grades than traditional-age college students are just getting an easier course, or that teachers are letting them slip by because they are sympathetic to the many demands on the adult student's life. Other reasons offered are that part-time faculty primarily teach for extra income and, thus, don't put much into their classes or expect much out of students; and/or that the continued employment of teachers of adults is based very much on students' satisfaction with their teaching--and the student with higher grades is the happier student!

Although there are occasions where any and all of these assumptions may hold true, I have consistently observed that adult students work harder, integrate more of their learning into real-life application, are more innovative in designing and conducting learning projects, and genuinely earn the higher grades. I would like to see more research in this area, in the hope of dispelling the persistent, negative beliefs about "grade inflation" for adult students.

Research that Offers Evidence to Teachers of Adults Regarding the Effectiveness of Adult Education, and Perhaps of Various Teaching Methods

There are 2 key points here: one is that we still have very little evidence, other than anecdotal, about the effectiveness of our practice. I am particularly interested in the postsecondary adult student, where measures of success must go beyond such things as reading levels and GED completion rates. There are a lot of us doing a lot of teaching of adults; and we could all benefit from some more evidence about our effectiveness.

Another aspect of this research--evidence and possibly comparison of the effectiveness of various teaching methods. There is a great need for ongoing education and training for the thousands of "educators of adults" who have no formal adult education background--and may not desire any. They do, however, want to know how to reach effectively, in varying circumstances, to meet diverse learning needs of students.

Issues in Research and Practice
Peyton Hutchinson

Initially, please know that the several issues noted below are not applicable to all professors of adult educations. However, predicated on experiences and observations as a teacher, a university instructor, a supervisor and an administrator, I believe that there is ample concern and a justifiable degree of interest in the issues, opinions or perceptions noted below.

The Preparedness of Adult Educators

With the above exception, it is my contention that universities with programs in adult education fail, to some extent, to properly teach or facilitate the education of teachers or potential teachers of adults, that research non-withstanding, many currently

employed teachers of adults fail, to some degree, to implement/apply what may be termed "appropriate practices" to their work in the field of adult education.

The Preparedness of Faculty

With the exception noted above, it is my contention that while professors of adult education are familiar with research and its applicability to instruction and programs in adult education and related fields, some professors of adult education are not, for the most part, knowledgeable of the adult education population about which their research relates. Stated differently, a large segment of these scholars are not what I term reality-based. They lack some of the essential experiences necessary to conduct research of a reality-based nature and therefore their research works lacks authenticity.

Application of Research Findings

It is my contention, with the above caveat, that teachers of adults, at most levels (literacy, ABE, ESL, undergraduate and graduate) are not prepared to apply legitimate research findings to classroom instructional settings; that if more teachers were familiar with and capable of applying these findings, instruction would be greatly enhanced. (For example, the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985) notes that teachers need extensive professional training and knowledge in subject matter.)

It is the writer's contention that the overwhelming majority of the teaching population, including those of us who teach adults, do not read or understand research findings and therefore are not able to apply same in their instruction. Further, if they did read the research they would not know the "process" or the "how" regarding its application. In short, I believe most teachers need to be shown or demonstrated the "how", the "process" and the application of research to professional teaching responsibilities. For example, we could look at some of the assumptions, the research, the literature and the facts about learning, about motivation, about pedagogy and andragogy. Many teachers of adults are ignorant of the above. Also, for purposes of discussion, I believe that teachers, for the most part, need to have demonstrated how to "conceptualize", "innovate" and "modify" classroom instructional methods, techniques and modes of presentation, all predicated on research findings, to become more effective practitioners of the art or science of teaching.

What are the professors of adult education doing to address these consequential issues?

A Response: The Research to Practice Problem

Hal Beder

For me, dealing with the issue of research to practice is like a reunion. Nearly twenty years ago I began my career in adult education research with the study of this problem, and the literature I read back then on the dissemination and utilization of innovations has influenced everything I have done since. Something bothered me back then, however. It seemed to me that there was something inherent in the difference between research and practice which was causing "the problem," but I could not put my finger on just what. Recently, after reading Robin Usher and Ian Bryant's Adult

Education as Theory, Practice and Research, I am beginning to understand what that something is.

The problem of research to practice lies in how we have conceived the problem: RESEARCH to practice. The problem as thus posed assumes that practice suffers, because practitioners fail to utilize the knowledge that we in academe produce. This conception, however, is based on questionable logic which in its extreme goes as follows:

Human behavior is lawful, and through the methods and procedures of empirical research, we are able to deduce the laws. Theory derived through empirical research enables us to explain and predict behavior. Through our methods, we arrive at the objective truth, and since our knowledge is true, it is the correct knowledge. Practitioner based knowledge is somehow flawed; it is subjective, biased, and miss-focused. It follows that good practice is based on good research.

There are two major problems with this logic, however. First, theory seeks to derive general laws of behavior, while practice is conducted in specific operational contexts. Consider, for example, a summary of the intellectual changes that occur in old age as outlined in a popular adult development text (Bee, 1987):

Some loss of verbal or crystallized IQ, but this is most noticeable in adults with poorer health, lower levels of activity, and less education. Continued loss of skill on fluid IQ measures. Slowing of retrieval processes and other memory processes; less skillful use of encoding strategies for new memories. Decline in problem-solving performance on both laboratory and real-life tasks (p. 144).

While such research findings might apply to older adults in general, what do they mean to a practitioner faced with a classroom of retirees? They might be true in this specific context, or they might not. Moreover, to assume on the basis of research that a particular group of older adults fits the profile, may lead to an inappropriate instructional response which is considered to be belittling or condescending by the learners. The general, as derived from research, can not be automatically applied to the specific, as represented by the practice context.

Second, claims to the "truth" of theory and research are undermined by the reality that the propositions of theory and the findings of research often conflict. There is no single psychological theory, for example, but many competing psychological theories. What should guide practice? Behaviorism? Humanism? Something else? Which theory is the closest to truth? One? All? None?

Practitioners, however, need systematic knowledge if they are to operate systematically, and they need theory if they are to make sense of what they do. Consequently, as Usher and Bryant note, practitioners develop practice-based theories based on knowledge acquired from experience. Such theories are not always functional, however, as they are often based on miss-information, miss-conception, and/or inherent bias. Practice can become a closed loop in which bad practice-based theory perpetuates itself.

Coming from outside the loop, academic theory and research can present new

avenues for consideration, new possibilities for understanding. Academic knowledge can, and should, aid in the process of critical reflection. Indeed, it is the critical reflection on experience, the constant dialogue between the concrete and the abstract, the ideal and reality that promotes good practice. Although truth is situational in a practice context, the seeking of it is vital nevertheless.

Good practice then is based on praxis, not on the mechanistic application of academic theory and research. Given this, the problem addressed here must be recast from "research to practice" to "research for praxis." There are several implications:

1) The value of academic knowledge lies not in its empirical truth, but in its ability to expand understanding and to contribute to critical reflection. As teachers, we should present theory and research not as "This is the way it is; master it," but rather as "This is the way it might be in your context; what does it mean for your praxis?
2) If we are serious about contributing to good practice, we need to conduct more situation specific, participatory-based research. At the same time we need to work toward the reform of the current academic reward system that makes doing such research so extremely difficult.
3) As academics, we also need to view our academic research efforts as praxis. We need much more critical reflection regarding what we do and why we do it. Until we do, we will continue to be held captive to the rigid procedures, traditions, and miss-assumptions of the academic milieu.

References

Usher, R. & Bryant, I. (1989). Adult Education As Theory, Practice and Research. New York: Routledge.

Bee, H. (1987). The Journey of Adulthood. New York: Macmillan.

Note

Ron Cervero and Victoria Marsick did not prepare papers for the proceedings. Their comments in the sessions supported the ideas that Hal Beder proposed. Ron also noted that he has addressed the topic of the session in "Relationships between Theory and Practice in Adult Education," a forthcoming chapter in Peters, J. and Jarvis, P. (Eds). Adult Education As a Field of Study: Its Evolution, Achievements and Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Task Force on Instructional Improvement

(Concurrent Session, 9:00 - 10:30 a.m., October 29)

How Effective is Your Teaching? Compare Yourselves to the Experts

Bob Nolan, Moderator (Oklahoma State University)

Burton Sisco (University of Wyoming)
Roger Hiemstra (Syracuse University)
Gary Dean (Indiana University of Pennsylvania)

The session was presented in three parts. Each part was originally planned to last 30 minutes. Part one consisted of a structured group activity (see enclosed form used by the participants); part two was a presentation by experts Burt Sisco and Roger Hiemstra, and part three was a period set aside to enable participants to question the experts.

The objectives of the small group activity included an attempt to stimulate participants to think analytically about the main issues of effective graduate teaching and to begin to identify effective practices used by their peers in the US and Canada. This segment of the session elicited a very positive response from the approximately thirty professors in attendance. In fact, this segment of the session ran to 45 minutes, rather than the originally planned 30.

The session had two purposes: 1) to get people thinking about the issues involved in effective graduate instruction in adult education, and 2) to generate a list of effective class room practices. The first was accomplished in the small groups, the second resulted from the reporting process.

Each group selected a recorder and used the following questions to generate discussion. 1) What activities generate the most excitement in your classroom? 2) What activities have given you the most consistent positive feedback from students? 3) What specific strategy would you most highly recommend to a new faculty member in Adult Education? Select the one or two ideas generated in your group which you feel are most effective for classroom instruction in graduate classes in adult education. These will be reported to the large group. There will be approximately 15 minutes to complete this activity and 15 minutes for reporting of small group lists. During the reporting out period, the following effective practices were identified with the knowledge that they represent practices which might be helpful to both beginning and seasoned professors.

1) General practices

a. obtain valuable feedback on the effectiveness of one's teaching by having students keep learning journals.
b. At mid-term conduct a group counseling session for the purpose of helping students answer the question:
Am I making progress in this course? Have students complete an anonymous written critique of their progress in the course; or, finally, elect a committe of three to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the course without the presence of the professor.

c. Assign field experiences to graduate students such as the observation of adult educators in a classroom or training site, or of adult education administrators.
d. Assign interviews in the community for the purpose of creating cases of life stage development, of self-directed learning, or of literacy training.
e. Assign the identification of a senior citizen in the community to whom the graduate student becomes adviser (mentor) or advisee in the conduct of two or three learning experiences.

2) Effective practices to assist graduate students in completing reading assignments which often appear daunting to those who are pursuing degrees as part-time students.

a. Give a lecturette pre-view or overview of the assigned readings.
b. Give a one page overview of the readings at the time they are assigned.

3) Practices designed to insure accurate communication of important content.

a. Be sure to begin your course with a clear, detailed syllabus.
b. Begin each session with clear, achievable objectives.

4) Practices to help graduate students achieve a so-called "transformation" in their thinking.

a. Include practice or application-type experiences, even devoting an entire class period to an application.
b. Use techniques which will involve the students with the content. Begin with the affective domain by use of famous quotes in an emotional context, examples, cases, or newspaper clippings. From an affective/emotional opener, move to more conceptual elements of the class and then close the class with another affective/emotional summary or recap.
c. Increase affect by using collaborative learning methods instead of using the competitive, let's-see-who-is-the-most-creative/brilliant approach.

5) Practices related to helping new faculty members faced with teaching a course for the first time.

a. Feel no shame about asking experienced faculty members or senior faculty members who have taught the course before to share syllabi or other materials.
b. Seek out mentors.
c. Ask senior faculty members to observe one's class.

The second segment of the session featured a presentation by Sisco and Hiemstra in which they presented a theoretical model for the "individualizing" of teaching in group settings. A process model (see handouts) was demonstrated through exposition and examples. The presentation which paralleled and somewhat summerized their recent book, was clear, highly conceptual, and of a level of sophistication appropriate to the group. Informal feedback after the session gave the organizers a qualitative "feel" that this segment of the session was highly regarded by the participants. The third segment of the session allowed participants to question Sisco and Hiemstra about their theoretical model. Most of the questions

were for clarification or for examples. The session would easily have gone overtime had the room not been needed for another scheduled activity. After carefully observing the activities of the Instructional Improvement Task Force, especially in view of the opening activity of the CPAE, this year's participants strongly felt that the Task Force has a well defined goal and that it meets a well defined need among the professorate. Gary Dean's comments that, perhaps, the designation "task force" may not fully describe this unit which provides a precisely defined service to the membership, merits further consideration.

APPENDICES

COMMISSION OF PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION
FACT SHEET

History of the Commission

An organizational meeting in 1955 led to the founding of the Commission in 1957. During the next five years, fewer than twenty professors from a dozen institutions with graduate programs with a major in adult education participated in annual Commission meetings. Over the years, the annual Commission meeting has been held in the fall. Commission members have also collaborated on projects during the year such as preparation of publications. Commission meetings and the publications have focused on joint efforts to strengthen the graduate programs represented in the Commission and to disseminate tested knowledge related to the field of adult and continuing education. Today, nearly 500 persons have been associated with the Commission, representing more than 85 graduate programs in the United States and Canada. The Commission is part of AAACE.

Current Purposes of the Commission

1. To facilitate interaction among Commission members so as to strengthen graduate programs for adult educators;
2. To broadly disseminate to the field systematic knowledge such as typically included in our programs of graduate study for adult educators;
3. To facilitate high quality performance by and useful relationships among members;
4. To encourage attention to research topics and methods important for adult education;
5. To help others better understand graduate study for people engaged in adult education work;
6. To study and take public positions on issues related to adult education.

Activities

Annual Meeting (generally held two days prior to the AAACE Conference)
- -General sessions
- -Working sessions of task forces and committees
- -Special interest sessions
- -Informal gatherings
- -Formal business meetings(s)

Newsletter (CPAE Newsletter is published three times a year)

Other - CPAE members individually or in groups contribute to the field by
- -publication and research
- -testifying before legislative groups
- -holding regional and ad hoc meetings
- -service on national projects and committees
- -participating in program reviews

Membership and Dues

Membership in the Commission of Professors is not automatic, but by application. Applications are reviewed by the membership committee of the Commission. The Executive Committee acts on recommendations from the membership committee.

Full Membership: Persons who are appointed on at least a half-time basis to the faculty of an accredited institution of higher education, and who are involved not less than half-time in instruction and/or research activities directed towards the preparation of adult education professionals and/or scholars. Annual dues required.

Affiliate Membership: Persons who do not meet the qualifications for full membership but who are interested in the activities of the Commission and who are willing to participate in them fully. Affiliate members may not vote in the business meetings of the Commission. Annual dues required.

Emeritus Membership: Retired professors who have made substantial contributions to the field of adult education may be nominated at the annual meeting for emeritus membership in the Commission, and approved by a majority of those attending. No dues required.

Affiliate members whose job responsibilities change to meet full membership qualifications may apply for a change to full status. Full members who are no longer eligible for that status will automatically be listed as affiliates unless they wish to sever connections with the Commission. Inactive members (those who do not pay Commission dues) will be dropped (eventually) from the roster of professors of adult education.

Structure

Officers are elected for two-year terms by a plurality of members attending the annual meeting. They include the chairperson (serves as chair-elect for a year prior to taking office); the secretary/treasurer; and the Executive Committee (four members, two elected each year).

Task forces are ad hoc groups which last as long as there is interest and activity in the work of the task force. They are formed by petition to the Executive Committee of ten or more current CPAE members, including one member willing to chair the task force. Current task forces include:

-Research & Theory Building
-International Adult Education
-Instructional Improvement
-Self-Directed Learning
-Faculty Development
-Human Resource Development
-Computer
-Critical Adult Education

Standing Committee members are appointed by the Executive Committee. Current committees include membership, nominations, archives, and publications.

Expectations

Each Commission member is expected to

-become involved in the work of one or more CPAE activities;
-be a member in good standing of AAACE;
-pay dues annually (usually at or immediately after the annual meeting).

CPAE OFFICERS AND TASK FORCE CHAIRS 1989-1990

Chair	Hanna Arlene Fingeret (North Carolina State University)
Secretary-Treasurer	Karen Watkins (University of Texas)
Executive Committee	Michael Collins (University of Saskatchewan) (Term expires 1990) Sean Courtenay (1991) (University of Nebraska) Victoria Marsick (1990) (Columbia University) Tom Valentine (1991) (University of Georgia)
Membership Chair	Barbara Florini (Syracuse University)
Computer Task Force	W. Lee Pierce (University of Southern Mississippi) John Friel (Kansas State University)
Critical Adult Education	David Little (University of Regina)
Human Resource Development	Gary Green (University of Oklahoma) Charles Oaklief (Kansas State University)
Instructional Improvement	Peter Murk (Ball State University) Robert Nolan (Oklahoma State University)
International Adult Education	Jorge Jeria (Northern Illinois University) Richard Wright (National College of Education)
Research and Theory	Daniele Flannery (Pennsylvania State Building University)
Self-Directed Learning	Adrianne Bonham (Texas A & M University)
Faculty Development	Ron Shearon (North Carolina State University)

CPAE OFFICERS AND TASK FORCE CHAIRS 1990-1991

Chair	Phyllis Cunningham (Northern State University)
Secretary-Treasurer and Membership Chair	Karen Watkins (University of Texas)
Executive Committee	Sean Courtenay (University of Nebraska) (Term expires 1991) Tom Valentine (1991) (University of Georgia) Jim Fisher (1992) (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) Betty Hayes (1992) (University of Wisconsin-Madison)
Computer Task Force	?
Critical Adult Education	Donna Amstutz (Northern Illinois University) Michael Welton (Dalhousie University) David Hemphill (San Francisco State University)
Human Resource Development	Bert Wiswell (Virginia Tech) Ken Paprock (Texas A & M University)
Instructional Improvement	Annette Greenland (University of North Carolina) Bob Nolan (Oklahoma State University)
International Adult Education	Ann Brooks (University of Texas - Austin) Hal Beder (Rutgers University)
Research and Theory Building	Emmalou Van Tilburg Norland (Ohio State University)
Self-Directed Learning	Adrienne Bonham (Texas A & M University) Lucy Guglielmino (Florida Atlantic University)

Faculty Development (Merged with Research and Theory Building)